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CHAPTER 9.

FROM THE DEMISE OF QUEEN ELIZABETH TO THE

DEATH OF ARCHBISHOP BANCROFT.

The royal house of the Stuarts has not been more calamitous to the English Church and nation in the male descendants, than successful and glorious in the female. The four kings of this line, while in power, were declared enemies of our civil constitution; they governed without law, levied taxes by the prerogative, and endeavoured to put an end to the very being of Parliaments. With regard to religion, the first two were neither sound Protestants nor good Catholics, but were for reconciling the two religions, and meeting the papists half way; but the last two went over entirely to the Church of Rome, and died professedly in her communion. The female branches of this family being married among foreign Protestants, were of a different stamp, being more inclined to Puritanism than popery; one of them [Mary, eldest daughter of King Charles I.] was mother of the great King William III., the glorious deliverer of these kingdoms from popery and slavery; and another [Elizabeth, daughter of King James I.] was grandmother of his late majesty King George I., in whom the Protestant succession took place, and whose numerous descendants in the person and offspring of his present majesty, are the defence and glory of the whole Protestant interest in Europe.

King James was thirty-six years of age when he came to the English throne, having reigned in Scotland from his infancy. In the year 1589 he married the Princess Anne, sister to the King of Denmark, by whom he had three children living at this time: Henry, prince of Wales, who died before he was nineteen years of age [1612]; Elizabeth, married to the elector palatine, 1613; and Charles, who succeeded his father in his kingdoms. His majesty’s behaviour in Scotland raised the expectations and hopes of all parties; the Puritans relied upon his majesty’s education, upon his subscribing the solemn league and covenant, and upon various solemn repeated declarations; in particular, one made in the General Assembly at Edinburgh, 1590: when standing with his bonnet off, and his hands lifted up to heaven, “he praised God that he was born in the time of the light of the Gospel, and in such a place as to be king of such a church, the sincerest [purest] kirk in the world. The Church of Geneva,” says he, “keep Pasche and Yule [Easter and Christmas], what have they for them! They have no institution. As for our neighbour Kirk of England, their service is an evil-said mass in English; they want nothing of the mass but the liftings. I charge you, my good ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity, and to exhort the people to do the same; and I, forsooth, as long as I brook my life, shall maintain the same.”[[1]](#footnote-1) In his speech to the Parliament, 1598, he tells them “that he minded not to bring in papistical or Anglican bishops.”[[2]](#footnote-2) Nay, upon his leaving Scotland to take possession of the crown of England, he gave public thanks to God in the kirk of Edinburgh, “that he had left both kirk and kingdom in that state which he intended not to alter any ways, his subjects living in peace.”[[3]](#footnote-3) But all this was kingcraft, or else his majesty changed his principles with the climate. The Scots ministers did not approach him with the distant submission and reverence of the English bishops, and therefore within nine months after he ascended the throne of England he renounced presbytery, and established it for a maxim, No bishop, no king. So soon did this pious monarch renounce his principles (if he had any), and break through the most solemn vows and obligations! When the Long Parliament addressed King Charles I. to set up presbytery in the room of episcopacy, his majesty objected his coronation oath, in which he had sworn to maintain the clergy in their rights and privileges; but King James had no such scruples of conscience; for without so much as asking the consent of Parliament, General Assembly, or people, he entered upon the most effectual measures to subvert the kirk discipline which he had sworn to maintain with hands lifted up to Heaven, at his coronation, and had afterward solemnly subscribed, with his queen and family, in the years 1581 and 1590.[[4]](#footnote-4)

The papists put the king in remembrance that he was born of Roman Catholic parents, and had been baptized according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of Rome; that his mother, of whom he usually spoke with reverence, was a martyr for that church; and that he himself, upon sundry occasions, had expressed no dislike to her doctrines, though he disallowed of the usurpations of the court of Rome over foreign princes; that he had called the Church of Rome his mother-church; and, therefore, they presumed to welcome his majesty into England with a petition for an open toleration.[[5]](#footnote-5)

But the bishops of the Church of England made the earliest application for his majesty’s protection and favour. As soon as the queen was dead, Archbishop Whitgift sent Dr. Nevil, dean of Canterbury, express into Scotland, in the name of all the bishops and clergy of England, to give his majesty assurance of their unfeigned duly and loyalty; to know what commands he had for them with respect to the ecclesiastical courts, and to recommend the Church of England to his countenance and favour.[[6]](#footnote-6) The king replied that he would uphold thegovernment of the Church as the queen left it; which comforted the timorous archbishop, who had sometimes spoke with great uneasiness of the Scotch *mist.*

Upon his majesty’s arrival all parties addressed him, and among others the Dutch and French churches, and the English Puritans; to the former his majesty gave this answer: “I need not use many words to declare my good-will to you, who have taken sanctuary here for the sake of religion; I am sensible you have enriched this kingdom with several arts and manufactures; and I swear to you, that if any one shall give you disturbance in your churches, upon your application to me, I will revenge your cause; and though you are none of my proper subjects, Iwill maintain and cherish you as much as any prince in the world.” But the latter, whatever they had reason to expect, met with very different usage.

Notwithstanding all the precautions that were taken to secure the elections of members for the next Parliament, the archbishop wished he might not live to see it, for fear of some alteration in the Church; for the Puritans were preparing petitions, and printing pamphlets in their own vindication, though by the archbishop’s vigilance, says Mr. Strype,[[7]](#footnote-7) not a petition or a pamphlet escaped without a speedy and effectual answer.

While the king was in his progress to London [April, 1603] the Puritans presented their millenary petition, so called, because it was said to be subscribed by a thousand hands, though there were not more than eight hundred out of twenty-five counties.[[8]](#footnote-8) It is entitled “The humble Petition of the Ministers of the Church of England, desiring Reformation of certain Ceremonies and Abuses of the Church.” The preamble sets forth, “that neither as factious men affecting a popular parity in the Church, nor as schismatics aiming at the dissolution of the state ecclesiastical, but as the faithful ministers of Christ, and loyal subjects to his majesty, they humbly desire the redress of some abuses.” And though divers of them had formerly subscribed to the service-book, some upon protestation, some upon an exposition given, and some with condition, yet now they, to the number of more than a thousand ministers, groaned under the burden of human rites and ceremonies, and with one consent threw themselves down at his royal feet for relief in the following particulars:

1. In the Church service. “That the cross in baptism, the interrogatories to infants, baptism by women, and confirmation, may be taken away; that the cap and surplice may not be urged; that examination may go before the communion; that the ring in marriage may be dispensed with; that the service may be abridged; church songs and music moderated to better edification; that the Lord’s Day may not be profaned, nor the observation of other holydays strictly enjoined; that ministers may not be charged to teach their people to bow at the name of Jesus; and that none but canonical Scriptures be read in the Church.”

2. Concerning ministers. “That none may be admitted but able men; that they be obliged to preach on the Lord’s Day; that such as are not capable of preaching may be removed or obliged to maintain preachers; that nonresidency be not permitted; that King Edward’s statute for the lawfulness of the marriage of the clergy be revived; and that ministers be not obliged to subscribe, but according to law, to the articles of religion, and the king’s supremacy only.”

3. For Church livings. “That bishops leave their commendams; that impropriations annexed to bishoprics and colleges be given to preaching incumbents only; and that lay-impropriations be charged with a sixth or seventh part for the maintenance of a preacher.”

4. For Church discipline. “That excommunication and censures be not in the name of lay-chancellors, &c.; that men be not excommunicated for twelvepenny matters, nor without consent of their pastors; that registrars’ places, and others having jurisdiction, do not put them out to farm; that sundry popish canons be revised; that the oath *ex officio* be more sparingly used; and licenses for marriages without bans be more sparingly granted.”

“These things,” say they, “we are able to show not to be agreeable to the Word of God, if it shall please your majesty to hear us, or by writing to be informed, or by conference among the learned to be resolved.”

The king met with sundry other petitions of the like nature from most of the counties he passed through; but the heads of the two universities having taken offence at the millenary petition, for demising away the impropriations annexed to bishoprics and colleges, which, says Fuller, would cut off more than the nipples of the breasts of both universities in point of maintenance,[[9]](#footnote-9) expressed their resentment different ways: those of Cambridge passed a grace, June 9th, 1603, “That whosoever in the University should openly oppose by word or writing, or any other way, the doctrine or discipline of the Church of England established by law, or any part thereof, should be suspended *ipso facto* from any degree already taken, and be disabled from taking any degree for the future.” About the same time the University of Oxford published an answer to the ministers’ petition, entitled “An Answer of the Vice-chancellor, Doctors, Proctors, and other Heads of Houses in the University of Oxford, to the Petition of the Ministers of the Church of England, desiring Reformation; dedicated to the King, with a Preface to the Archbishop, the Chancellors of both Universities, and the two Secretaries of State.”[[10]](#footnote-10) The answer shows the high spirit of the University: it reproaches the ministers in very severe language for subscribing and then complaining; it reflects upon them as factious men, for affecting a parity in the Church, and then falls severely on the Scots Reformation, which his majesty had so publicly commended before he left that kingdom. It throws an odium upon the petitioners, as being for a limited monarchy, and for subjecting the titles of kings to the approbation of the people. It then goes on to vindicate all the grievances complained of, and concludes with beseeching his majesty not to suffer the peace of the state to be disturbed by allowing these men to disturb its polity. “Look upon the Reformed churches abroad,” say they: “wheresoever the desire of the petitioners takes place, how ill it suits with the state of monarchy; does it become the supereminent authority and regal person of a king to subject his sovereign power to the overswaying and all-commanding power of a presbytery; that his meek and humble clergy should have power to bind their king in chains, and their prince in links of iron? that is, to censure him, and, if they see cause, to proceed against him as a tyrant. That the supreme magistrate should only be a maintainer of their proceedings, but not a commander in them; these are but petty abridgments of the prerogative royal, while the king submits his sceptre to the sceptre of Christ, and licks the dust of the Church’s feet.” They then commend the present Church government as the great support of the crown, and calculated to promote unlimited subjection, and aver, “that there are at this day more learned men in this land, in this one kingdom, than are to be found among all the ministers of religion in France, Flanders, Germany, Poland, Denmark, Geneva, Scotland, or (to speak in a word) all Europe besides.”[[11]](#footnote-11) Such a vainglorious piece of self-applause is hardly to be met with. They must have a mean opinion of the king’s acquaintance with the learned world, to use him in this manner, at a time when, though there were some very considerable divines among ourselves, there were as many learned men in the foreign universities as had been known since the Reformation; witness the Bezas, Scaligers, Casaubons, &c., whose works have transmitted their great names down to posterity.

And that the divines of Cambridge might not come behind their brethren of Oxford, the heads of that university wrote a letter of thanks to the Oxonians for their answer to the petition, in which “they applaud and commend their weighty arguments, and threaten to battle the Puritans with numbers; for if Saul has his thousands (say they), David has his ten thousands. They acquaint them with their decree of June 9, and bid the poor pitiful Puritans [*homunciones miserrimi*] answer their almost a thousand books in defence of the hierarchy before they pretend to dispute before so learned and wise a king.”[[12]](#footnote-12) A mean and pitiful triumph over honest and virtuous men, who aimed at nothing more than to bring the discipline of the Church a little nearer the standard of Scripture!

But that his majesty might part with his old friends with some decency, and seem to answer the request of the petitioners, he agreed to have a conference with the two parties at Hampton Court,[[13]](#footnote-13) for which purpose he published a proclamation from Wilton, October 24th, 1603, touching a meeting for the hearing and for the determining things pretended to be amiss in the Church. In which he declares “that he was already persuaded that the constitution of the Church of England was agreeable to God’s Word, and near to the condition of the primitive Church; yet because he had received information that some things in it were scandalous, and gave offence, he had appointed a meeting, to be had before himself and council, of divers bishops and other learned men, at which consultation he hoped to be better informed of the state of the Church, and whether there were any such enormities in it; in the mean time, he commanded all his subjects not to publish anything against the state ecclesiastical, or to gather subscriptions, or make supplications, being resolved to make it appear by their chastisement how far such a manner of proceeding was displeasing to him, for he was determined to preserve the ecclesiastical state in such form as he found it established by the law, only to reform such abuses as he should find apparently proved.”[[14]](#footnote-14)

The archbishop and his brethren had been indefatigable in possessing the king with the excellence of the English hierarchy, as coming near the practice of the primitive Church, and best suited to a monarchical government; they represented the Puritans as turbulent and factious, inconsiderable in number, and aiming at confusion both in Church and State; and yet, after all, the old archbishop was doubtful of the event, for in one of his letters to Cecil, afterward Earl of Shrewsbury, he writes, “Though our humorous and contentious brethren have made many petitions and motions correspondent to their natures, yet to my comfort they have not much prevailed. Your lordship, I am sure, does imagine that I have not all this while been idle, nor greatly quiet in mind, for who can promise himself rest among so many vipers?”[[15]](#footnote-15)

The place of conference was the drawing-room within the privy-chamber at Hampton Court; the disputants on both sides were nominated by the king. For the Church there were nine bishops, and about as many dignitaries, viz., Dr. Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury; Dr. Bancroft, bishop of London; Dr. Mathew, bishop of Durham; Bilson, bishop of Winchester; Babington, bishop of Worcester; Rudd, bishop of St. David’s; Watson, bishop of Chichester; Robinson, bishop of Carlisle; and Dove, bishop of Peterborough. Dr. Andrews, dean of the chapel; Overal, dean of St. Paul’s; Barlow, dean of Chester; Bridges, dean of Salisbury; Field, dean of Gloucester; and King, archdeacon of Nottingham; besides the deans of Worcester and Windsor.

For the Puritans were only four ministers: Dr. John Raynolds, Dr. Thomas Sparks, professors of divinity in Oxford; Mr. Chadderton and Mr. Knewstubs, of Cambridge. The divines of the Church appeared in the habits of their respective distinctions; but those for the Puritans in fur gowns, like the Turkey merchants, or the professors in foreign universities. When the king conferred with the bishops, he behaved with softness, and a great regard to their character; but when the Puritan ministers stood before him, instead of being moderator, he took upon him the place of respondent, and bore them down with his majestic frowns and threatenings, in the midst of a numerous crowd of courtiers, all the lords of the privy-council being present; while the bishops stood by, and were little more than spectators of the triumph.

The account of this conference was published at large only by Dr. Barlow, who, being a party, says Fuller,[[16]](#footnote-16) set a sharp edge on his own, and a blunt one on his adversaries’ weapons. Dr. Sparks and Raynolds complained that they were wronged by that relation,[[17]](#footnote-17) and Dr. Jackson declared that Barlow himself repented, upon his deathbed, of the injury he had done the Puritan ministers in his relation of the Hampton Court Conference.[[18]](#footnote-18) Mr. Strype has lately published a letter of the Bishop of Durham to Hutton, archbishop of York, which agrees pretty much with Barlow;[[19]](#footnote-19) but Mr. Patrick Galloway, a Scotsman, has set things in a different light; from all these, and from the king’s own letter to Mr. Blake, a Scotsman, we must form the best judgment of it that we can.

The conference continued three days, viz., January the 14th, 16th, and 18th; the first was with the bishops and deans alone, January 14th. the Puritan ministers not being present, when the king made a speech in commendation of the hierarchy of the Church of England, and congratulated himself that “he was now come into the promised land; that he sat among grave and reverend men, and was not a king, as formerly, without state, nor in a place where beardless boys would brave him to his face. He assured them he had not called this assembly for any innovation, for he acknowledged the government ecclesiastical, as now it is to have been approved by manifold blessings from God himself; but because he had received some complaints of disorders, he was willing to remove them if scandalous, and to take notice of them if but trilling; that the reason of his consulting them by themselves was to receive satisfaction from them, (1.) About some things in the Common Prayer Book; (2.) Concerning excommunication in the ecclesiastical courts; (3.) About providing some well-qualified ministers for Ireland; that if anything should be found meet to be redressed, it might be done without their being confronted by their opponents.”[[20]](#footnote-20)

In the Common Prayer Book his majesty had some scruples about the confirmation of children, as it imported a confirmation of baptism. But the archbishop on his knees replied, that the Church did not hold baptism imperfect without confirmation. Bancroft said it was of apostolical institution, Heb., iv., 2, where it is called “the doctrine of the laying on of hands.” But to satisfy the king, it was agreed that the words *examination of children* should be added to confirmation.

His majesty excepted to the absolution of the Church, as too nearly resembling the pope’s pardon. But the archbishop is said to clear it up to the king’s satisfaction; only to the rubric of the general absolution these words were to be added, for explanation’s sake, *remission of sins.*

He farther objected to private baptism, and baptism by women. It had been customary till this time for bishops to license midwives to their office, and to allow their right to baptize in cases of necessity, under the following oath:

“1, Eleanor ——, admitted to the office and occupation of a midwife, will faithfully and diligently exercise the said office, according to such cunning and knowledge as God has given me, and that I will be ready to help and aid as well poor as rich women, being in labour and travail with child, and will always be ready to execute my said office. Also, I will not permit or suffer that any woman, being in labour or travail, shall name any other to be the father of the child than only he who is the right and true father thereof; and that I will not suffer any other body’s child to be set, brought, or laid before any woman delivered of child, in the place of her natural child, so far forth as I can know or understand. Also, I will not use any kind of sorcery or incantation in the time of travail of any woman; and I will not destroy the child born of any woman, nor rent nor pull off the head thereof, or otherwise dismember or hurt the same, or suffer it to be so hurt, &c. Also, that in the ministration of the sacrament of baptism, in the time of necessity, I will use the accustomed words of the same sacrament; that is to say, these words following, or to the like effect, ‘I christen thee in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,’ and none other profane words. And that, in baptizing any infant born, and pouring water on the head of the said infant, I will use pure and clean water, and not any rose or damask water, or water made of any confection or mixture. And that I will certify the curate of the parish church of every such baptizing.”[[21]](#footnote-21)

Notwithstanding this oath, Whitgift assured the king that baptism by women and lay persons was not allowed by the Church. Others said it was a reasonable practice, the minister not being of the essence of the sacrament. But the king not being satisfied, it was referred to consideration whether the word *curate,* or *lawful minister,* might not be inserted into the rubric for private baptism.

Concerning excommunication for lesser crimes in ecclesiastical courts, it was agreed that the name should be changed, but the same censure retained, or an equivalent thereunto appointed. These were all the alterations that were agreed upon between the king and bishops in the first day’s conference.

Mr. Patrick Galloway, who was present at the conference, gives this account of it to the presbytery of Edinburgh: “That on January 12 the king commanded the bishops, as they would answer it to God in conscience, and to himself upon their obedience, to advise among themselves of the corruptions of the Church in doctrine, ceremonies, and discipline, who, after consultation, reported that all was well; but when his majesty, with great fervency, brought instances to the contrary, the bishops on their knees craved with great earnestness that nothing might be altered, lest popish recusants, punished by penal statutes for disobedience, and the Puritans, punished by deprivation from their callings and livings for nonconformity, should say they had just cause to insult upon them, as men who had travailed to bind them to that which by their own mouths now was confessed to be erroneous.”[[22]](#footnote-22) Mr. Strype calls this an aspersion, but I am apt to think him mistaken, because Mr. Galloway adds these words: “When sundry persons gave out copies of these actions, I myself took occasion, as I was an ear and eye witness, to set them down, and presented them to his majesty, who with his own hand mended some things, and eked out others that I had omitted.” It is very certain that Bishop Barlow has cut off and concealed all the speeches that his majesty made against the corruptions of the Church and the practices of the prelates, for five hours together, according to the testimony of Dr. Andrews, dean of the chapel, who said that his majesty did that day wonderfully play the Puritan.

The second day’s conference was on Monday, January 16th, when the four ministers were called in, with Mr. Galloway, minister of Perth in Scotland, on the one part, and two bishops and six or eight deans on the other, the rest being secluded. The king being seated in his chair, with his nobles and privy counsellors around him, let them know he was now ready to hear their objections against the establishment. Whereupon Dr. Raynolds, in the name of his brethren, humbly requested,

1. That the doctrine of the Church might be preserved pure, according to God’s Word.

2. That good pastors might be planted in all churches to preach the same.

3. That the Book of Common Prayer might be fitted to more increase of piety.

4. That church government might be sincerely ministered according to God’s Word.

1. With regard to the doctrine of the Church, he requested that to those words in the sixteenth article, “We may depart from grace,” may be added, *neither totally nor finally,* to make them consistent with the doctrine of predestination in the seventeenth article; and that (if his majesty pleased) the nine articles of Lambeth might be inserted. That in the twenty-third article these words, “in the congregation,” might be omitted, as implying a liberty for men to preach out of the congregation without a lawful call. That in the twenty-fifth article the ground for confirmation might be examined; one passage confessing it to be a depraved imitation of the apostles, and another grounding it on their example; besides, that it was too much work for a bishop—

Here Bancroft, no longer able to contain himself, falling upon his knees, begged the king with great earnestness to stop the doctor’s mouth, according to an ancient canon that schismatics are not to be heard against their bishops. It is not reasonable, says he, that men who have subscribed to these articles should be allowed to plead against their own act, contrary to the statute 1st Eliz. The king, perceiving the bishop in a heat, said, My lord, you ought not to interrupt the doctor, but either let him proceed or answer what he has objected. Upon which he replied, “that as to Dr. Raynolds’s first objection, the doctrine of predestination was a desperate doctrine, and had made many people libertines, who were apt to say, ‘If I shall be saved, I shall be saved:’ he therefore desired it might be left at large. That his second objection was trifling, because, by the practice of the Church, none but licensed ministers might preach or administer the sacrament. And as to the doctor’s third objection, he said that the bishops had their chaplains and curates to examine such as were to be confirmed; and that in ancient time, none confirmed but bishops.” To which Raynolds replied, in the words of St. Jerome, “that it was rather a compliment to the order than from any reason or necessity of the thing.” And whereas the bishop had called him a schismatic, he desired his majesty that that imputation might not lie upon him; which occasioned a great deal of mirth and raillery between the king and his nobles about the unhappy Puritans. In conclusion, the king said he was against increasing the number of articles or stuffing them with theological niceties, because, were they never so explicit, there will be no preventing contrary opinions. As to confirmation, he thought it not decent to refer the solemnity to a parish priest, and closed his remarks with this maxim, No bishop, no king.

After a long interruption the doctor went on, and desired a new catechism; to which the king consented, provided there might be no curious questions in it, and that our agreement with the Roman Catholics in some points might not be esteemed heterodoxy. He farther desired a new translation of the Bible, to which his majesty agreed, provided it were without marginal notes, saying, that of all the translations, the Geneva was the worst, because of the marginal notes, which allowed disobedience to kings. The doctor complained of the printing and dispersing popish pamphlets, which reflected on Bancroft’s character: the king said, “What was done of this kind was by warrant from the court, to nourish the schism between the seculars and Jesuits, which was of great service. Doctor, you are a better collegeman than statesman.” To which Raynolds replied, that he did not intend such books as were printed in England, but such as were imported from beyond sea; and this several of the privy council owned to be a grievance. The doctor having prayed that some effectual remedy might be provided against the profanation of the Lord’s Day, declared he had no more to add on the first head.

2. With regard to preaching, the doctor complained of pluralities in the Church, and prayed, that all parishes might be furnished with preaching ministers. Upon which Bancroft fell upon his knees, and petitioned his majesty that all parishes might have a praying ministry; for preaching is grown so much in fashion, says he, that the service of the Church is neglected. Besides, pulpit harangues are very dangerous; he therefore humbly moved that the number of homilies might be increased, and that the clergy might be obliged to read them instead of sermons, in which many vented their spleen against their superiors. The king asked the plaintiffs their opinion of the bishop’s motion; who replied, that a preaching minister was certainly best and most useful, though they allowed, where preaching could not be had, godly prayers, homilies, and exhortations might do much good. The lord-chancellor [Egerton] said, there were more livings that wanted learned men than learned men living; let all, therefore, have single coats before others have doublets. Upon which Bancroft replied merrily, But a doublet is good in cold weather. The king put an end to the debate by saying he would consult the bishops upon this head.

3. But the doctor’s chief objections were to the service-book and church government. Here he complained of the late subscriptions, by which many were deprived of their ministry who were willing to subscribe to the doctrinal articles of the Church, to the king’s supremacy, and to the statutes of the realm. “He excepted to the reading the Apocrypha; to the interrogatories in baptism, and to the sign of the cross; to the surplice, and other superstitious habits; to the ring in marriage; to the churching of women by the name of purification. He urged that most of these things were relics of popery; that they had been abused to idolatry, and therefore ought, like the brazen serpent, to be abolished. Mr. Knewstubs said these rights and ceremonies were at best but indifferent, and therefore doubted whether the power of the Church could bind the conscience without impcaching Christian liberty.

Here his majesty interrupted them, and said that he apprehended the surplice to be a very comely garment; that the cross was as old as Constantine, and must we charge him with popery? besides, it was no more a significant sign than imposition of hands, which the petitioners allowed in ordination; and as for their other exceptions, they were capable of being understood in a sober sense; “but as to the power of the Church in things indifferent,” says his majesty, “I will not argue that point with you, but answer as kings in Parliament, *Le Roy s’avisera.* This is like Mr. John Black, a beardless boy, who told me, the last conference in Scotland, that he would hold conformity with me in doctrine, but that every man as to ceremonies was to be left to his own liberty, but I will have none of that; I will have one doctrine, one discipline, one religion in substance and ceremony: never speak more to that point, how far you are bound to obey.”

4. Dr. Raynolds was going on to complain of excommunication by lay-chancellors; but the king having said that he should consult the bishops on that head, the doctor desired that the clergy might have assemblies once in three weeks; that in rural deaneries they might have the liberty of prophesyings, as in Archbishop Grindal’s time; that those cases which could not be resolved there might be referred to the archdeacon’s visitation, and from thence to the diocesan synod, where the bishop with his presbyters should determine such points as were too difficult for the other meetings. Here the king broke out into a flame, and instead of hearing the doctor’s reasons, or commanding his bishops to answer them, told the ministers that he found they were aiming at a Scots presbytery, “which,” says he, “agrees with monarchy as well as God and the devil; then Jack and Tom, Will and Dick, shall meet, and at their pleasure censure both me and my council. Therefore, pray stay one seven years before you demand that of me, and if then you find me pursy and fat, and my windpipe stuffed, I will perhaps hearken to you; for let that government be up, and I am sure I shall be kept in breath; but till you find I grow lazy, pray let that alone. I remember how they used the poor lady, my mother, in Scotland, and me in my minority.” Then turning to the bishops, he put his hand **t**ohis hat and said, “My lords, I may thank you that these Puritans plead for my supremacy, for if once you are out and they in place, I know what would become of my supremacy, for, Nobishop, no king. Well, doctor, have you anything else to offer?” Dr. Raynolds; “No more, if it please your majesty.” Then rising from his chair, the king said, “If this be all your party have to say, I will make them conform, or I will harry them out of this land, or else worse;” and he was as good as his word.

Thus ended the secund day’s conference, after four hours’ discourse, with a perfect triumph on the side of the Church; the Puritan ministers were insulted, ridiculed, and laughed to scorn, without either wit or good manners. One of the council said he now saw that a Puritan was a Protestant frighted out of his wits. Another, that the ministers looked more like Turks than Christians, as appeared by their habits. Sir Edward Peyton confessed that Dr. Raynolds and his brethren had not freedom of speech; but finding it to no purpose to reply, they held their peace. On the other hand, the bishops and courtiers flattered the king’s wisdom and learning beyond measure, calling him the Solomon of the age. Bancroft fell upon his knees, and said, “I protest my heart melteth for joy, that Almighty God, of his singular mercy, has given us such a king as, since Christ’s time, has not been.” Chancellor Egerton said “he had never seen the king and priest so fully united in one person.”[[23]](#footnote-23) His majesty was no less satisfied with his own conduct; for in his letter to Mr. Blake, a Scotsman, he told him that he had soundly peppered off the Puritans, that they had fled before him, and that their petitions had turned him more earnestly against them. “It were no reason,” says his majesty, “that those who refuse the airy sign of the cross after baptism, should have their purses stuffed with any more solid and substantial crosses. They fled me so from argument to argument, without ever answering me directly (*ul est eorum moris*)*,* that I was forced to tell them, that if any of them, when boys, had disputed thus in the college, the moderator would have fetched them up, and applied the rod to their buttocks—1 have a book of theirs that may convert infidels, but never shall convert me, except by turning me more earnestly against them.” This was the language of the Solomon of the age. I leave the reader to judge how much superior the wise monarch was in the knowledge of antiquity, or the art of syllogism, to Dr. Raynolds, who was the oracle of his time for acquaintance with ecclesiastical history, councils, and fathers, and had lived in a college all his days.

The third day’s conference was on Wednesday, January 18th, when the bishops and deans were first called into the privy chamber with the civilians, to satisfy the king about the high commission and the oath *ex officio,* which they might easily do as being principal branches of his prerogative. When the king said he approved of the wisdom of the law in making the oath *ex officio,* the old archbishop was so transported as to cry out, “Undoubtedly your majesty speaks by the special assistance of God’s Spirit.” A committee of bishops and privy counsellors was then appointed to consider of lessening the charges in the high commission, and for planting schools, and proper ministers in the kingdom of Ireland, and on the borders of England and Scotland. After which, Dr. Raynolds and his brethren were called in, not to dispute, but only to hear the few alterations or explanations in the Common Prayer Book already mentioned; which not answering their expectations, Mr. Chadderton fell on his knees, and humbly prayed that the surplice and cross might not be urged on some godly ministers in Lancashire; and Mr. Knewstubs desired the same favour for some Suffolk ministers; which the bishops were going to oppose, but the king replied, with a stern countenance, “We have taken pains here to conclude, in a resolution for uniformity, and you will undo all by preferring the credit of a few private men to the peace of the Church; this is the Scots way, but I will have none of this arguing; therefore let them conform, and that quickly, too, or they shall hear of it; the bishops will give them some time, but if they are of an obstinate and turbulent spirit, I will have them enforced to conformity.”[[24]](#footnote-24)

Thus ended this mock conference,[[25]](#footnote-25) for it deserves no better name, all things being previously concluded between the king and the bishops, before the Puritans were brought upon the stage, to be made a spectacle to their enemies, and borne down, not with calm reason and argument, but with the royal authority, I approve or I dissent; the king making himself both judge and party.[[26]](#footnote-26) No wonder, therefore, if Dr. Raynolds fell below himself, and lost some part of his esteem with the Puritans, being overawed by the place and company, and the arbitrary dictates of his sovereign opponent.

The Puritans refused to be concluded by this conference, for the following reasons: because,

1. “The ministers appointed to speak for them were not of their nomination or choosing, nor of one judgment in the points of controversy; for being desired by their brethren to argue against the corruptions of the Church as simply evil, they replied, they were not so persuaded. Being farther desired to acquaint the king that some of their brethren thought them sinful, they refused that also. Lastly, being desired to give their reasons in writing why they thought the ceremonies only indifferent, or to answer the reasons they had to offer to prove them sinful, they would do neither one nor other.

2. “Because the points in controversy were not thoroughly debated, but nakedly propounded, and some not at all touched. Neither was there any one argument to the purpose pursued and followed.

3. “Because the prelates took the liberty of interrupting at their pleasure those of the other side, insomuch that they were checked for it by the king himself.”

They objected also to the account of the conference by Dean Barlow, as published without the knowledge, advice, or consent of the other side, and therefore deserving no credit; they said that Dr. Moreton had called some part of it in question, and rectified some speeches fathered on the king; besides, that the prelates only were present at the first day’s conference, when the principal matters were determined.

“Therefore the Puritan ministers offer (if his majesty will give them leave) in one week’s space to deliver his majesty in writing a full answer to any argument or assertion propounded in that conference by any prelate; and in the mean time they do aver them to be most vain and frivolous.”

If the bishops had been men of moderation, or if the king bad discovered any part of that wisdom he was flattered with, all parties might have been made easy at this time; for the bishops, in such a crisis, would have complied with anything his majesty had insisted on; but the king’s cowardice, his love of flattery, his high and arbitrary principles, and his mortal hatred of the Puritans, lost one of the fairest opportunities that have ever offered to heal the divisions of the Church.

On the 5th of March the king published a proclamation, in which he says, “That though the doctrine and discipline of the established Church were unexceptionable, and agreeable to primitive antiquity, nevertheless he had given way to a conference, to hear the exceptions of the Nonconformists, which he had found very slender; but that some few explanations of passages had been yielded to for their satisfaction; therefore he now requires and enjoins all his subjects to conform to it, as the only public form established in this realm; and admonishes them not to expect any farther alterations, for that his resolutions were absolutely settled.” The Common Prayer Book was accordingly printed with the amendments, and the proclamation prefixed.

It was a high strain of the prerogative to alter a form of worship established by law, merely by a royal proclamation, without consent of Parliament or convocation; for by the same power that his majesty altered one article in the liturgy, he might set aside the whole, every sentence being equally established by act of Parliament; but this wise monarch made no scruple of dispensing with the laws. However, the force of all proclamations determining with the king’s life, and there being no subsequent act of Parliament to establish these amendments, it was urged very justly in the next reign, that this was not the liturgy of the Church of England established by law, and, consequently, not binding upon the clergy.

A fortnight before this conference was held, the learned and reverend Mr. Thomas Cartwright, one of the chief of the Puritans, and a great sufferer for nonconformity, died. He was born in Hertfordshire, 1535, and entered into St. John’s College, Cambridge, 1550, where he became a hard student, never sleeping above five hours in a night. During the reign of Queen Mary he left the University, and became a lawyer’s clerk; but upon the accession of Queen Elizabeth he resumed his theological studies, and was chosen fellow of Trinity College in the year 1563. The year following he bore a part in the Philosophy Act before the queen. In the year 1567 he commenced bachelor of divinity, and three years after was chosen Lady Margaret’s professor. He was so popular a preacher, that when his turn came at St. Mary’s, the sexton was obliged to take down the windows. But Mr. Cartwright venturing in some of his lectures to show the defects of the discipline of the Church as it then stood, he was questioned for it before the vice-chancellor, denied his doctor’s degree, and expelled the University, as has been related. He then travelled to Geneva, and afterward became preacher to the English merchants at Antwerp. King James invited him to be professor in his University of St. Andrew’s, which he declined. After his return from Antwerp he was often in trouble by suspensions, deprivations, and long imprisonment; at length the great Earl of Leicester, who knew his worth, made him governor of his hospital in Warwick, where he ended his days, December 27, 1603. He was certainly one of the most learned and acute disputants of his age, but very ill used by the governing clergy. He wrote several books, besides his controversy with Archbishop Whitgift, as his Latin comment on Ecclesiastes, dedicated to King James, in which he thankfully acknowledges his being appointed professor to a Scots university; his celebrated confutation of the Rhemist translation of the New Testament, to which work he was solicited not only by Sir Francis Walsingham, but by letter under the hands of the principal divines of Cambridge, as, Roger Goad, Win. Whitaker, Thomas Crooke, John Ireton, Wm. Fulke, John Field, Nicholas Crane, Gibs Seinthe, Richard Gardiner, Wm. Clarke, &c. Such an opinion had these great men of his learning and abilities.[[27]](#footnote-27) He was a person of uncommon industry and piety, fervent in prayer, a frequent preacher, and of a meek and humble spirit. In his old age he was so troubled with the stone and gout by frequent lying in prisons, that he was obliged always to study on his knees. His last sermon was on Eccles., xii. 7: “Then shall the dust return to the earth, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it.” The Tuesday following he was two hours on his knees in private prayer, and a few hours after quietly resigned his spirit to God, in the sixty-eighth year of his age, and was buried in his own hospital. The famous Mr. Dod preached his funeral sermon.[[28]](#footnote-28)

Six weeks after died his great antagonist, Dr. John Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury, who was born at Great Grimsby, in Lincolnshire, in the year 1530, and educated in Pembroke Hall, and was fellow of Peter House, Cambridge. He complied with the changes in Queen Mary’s reign, though he disapproved of her religion. He commenced doctor of divinity 1569, and was afterward Margaret and queen’s professor,[[29]](#footnote-29) and master of Trinity College. Having been a celebrated champion for the hierarchy, the queen advanced him first to the Bishopric of Worcester, and then to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. He was a severe governor of the Church, pressing conformity with the utmost rigour,[[30]](#footnote-30) in which her majesty always gave him her countenance and support. He regarded neither the entreaties of poor ministers nor the intercessions of courtiers, being steady to the laws, and even outgoing them in the cause of uniformity. Mr. Fuller says he would give fair words and good language, but would abate nothing. Sir G. Paul, the author of his life, says that choler was his chief infirmity,[[31]](#footnote-31) which has sufficiently appeared by the account already given of the many persecutions, oppressions, and unjustifiable hardships the Puritans suffered under his administration; notwithstanding which they increased prodigiously, insomuch, that towards the end of his life, his grace grew weary of the invidious employment, and being afraid of King James’s first Parliament,[[32]](#footnote-32) died, as it is said, with grief before it met, desiring rather to give an account of his bishopric to God than exercise it among men.[[33]](#footnote-33) He had been at court the first Sunday in Lent, and as he was going to the council-chamber to dinner, was seized with the dead palsy on the right side, and with the loss of his speech: upon which he was carried first to the lord-treasurer’s chamber, and afterward to Lambeth, where the king visited him on Tuesday, but not being able to converse, lifted up his eyes and hand and said, *Pro ecclcsia Dei,* which were his last words. He would have written something, but could not hold his pen. His disease increasing, he expired the next day, being the 29th of February, 1603, aged seventy-three, and was buried at Croydon on the 27th of March following, where he has a fair monument, with his effigies at length upon it. He was an hospitable man, and usually travelled with a great retinue; in the year 1589 he came into Canterbury with a train of five hundred horse, of which one hundred were his own servants. He founded an hospital and free school at Croydon, and though he was a cruel persecutor of the Puritans, yet, compared with his successor, Bancroft, he was a valuable prelate.[[34]](#footnote-34)

Before the meeting of the Parliament the king issued out two proclamations, one commanding all Jesuits and priests in orders to depart the kingdom [February 22, 1603], wherein he was very careful to let the world know that he did not banish them out of hatred to the Catholic religion, but only for maintaining the pope’s temporal power over princes.[[35]](#footnote-35) The other was against the Puritans, in which there was no indulgence for tender consciences: all must conform, or suffer the extremities of the law.[[36]](#footnote-36)

The king opened the first session of Parliament with a long speech, in which there are many strokes in favour of tyranny and arbitrary power: “his majesty acknowledges the Roman Church to be His mother-church, though defiled with some infirmities and corruptions. That his mind was ever free from persecution for matters of conscience, as he hopes those of that religion have proved since his first coming. He pities the laity among them, and would indulge their clergy if they would but renounce the pope’s supremacy and his pretended power to dispense with the murder of kings. He wishes that he might be a means of uniting the two religions, for if they would but abandon their late corruptions, he would meet them m the midway, as having a great veneration fur antiquity in the points of ecclesiastical policy. But then, as to the Puritans or Novelists, who do not differ from us so much in points of religion as in their confused form of policy and purity, those,” says he, “are discontented with the present church government; they are impatient to suffer any superiority, which makes their sect insufferable in any well-governed commonwealth. ”[[37]](#footnote-37)

The bishops and their adherents were pleased with this speech, because the king seemed resolved not to indulge the Puritans at any rate; the Catholics did not like his majesty’s distinction between the laics and clerics; but the Puritans had most reason to complain, to see so much charity expressed towards papists, and so little for themselves.[[38]](#footnote-38) All Protestants in general heard with concern the king’s offer to meet the papists half way. What does he mean? say they; is there no difference, between popery and Protestantism but the pope’s authority over princes? Are all other doctrines to be given up? Are the religions the same? And is this the only point upon which we separated from the Church of Rome? Thus, unhappily, did this pretended Protestant prince set out with laying the foundation of discontent among all ranks of his people.

His majesty made frequent mention in his speech of his hereditary right to the crown, and of his lineal descent; that he was accountable to none but God; and that the only difference between a rightful king and a tyrant is, that the one is ordained for preserving the prosperity of his people, the other thinks his kingdom and people are ordained to satisfy his unreasonable appetites.[[39]](#footnote-39) Farther, his majesty altered the writs for electing members, and took upon him to prescribe what sort of representatives should be elected, not by way of exhortation, but of command, and as indispensable conditions of their being admitted into the House, and which were to be judged of and determined in the Court of Chancery.[[40]](#footnote-40) He threatened to fine and disfranchise those corporations that did not choose to his mind, and to fine and imprison their representatives if they presumed to sit in the House. When the House of Commons met, he interrupted their examinations of elections, and commanded the return of Sir Francis Goodwin, whose election they had set aside, to be brought before him and his judges. Most of those who approached the king’s person laboured to inspire him with the design of making himself absolute, or, rather, to confirm him in that resolution.[[41]](#footnote-41) The bishops were of this number; and from this time there has appeared among the clergy a party of men who have carried the obedience of the subject and the authority of the crown as high as in the most arbitrary monarchies.

But though the court and bishops were so well agreed, the Parliament passed some acts which gave them uneasiness; as the revival of the statute of Edward VI. which enacts that all processes, citations, judgments, &c., in any ecclesiastical courts, shall be issued in the king’s name, and under the king’s seal of arms. The bishops were said to be asleep when they suffered this clause to pass; but the Laudean clergy broke through it afterward, as they did through everything else that stood in the way of their sovereignty. It was farther enacted that all leases or grants of Church lands to the king, or his heirs, &c., for more than twenty-one years for the future, should be made void, which put an effectual stop to the alienation of the Church’s revenues. The marriages of the clergy were also legitimated, by reviving the statute of King Edward VI. for that purpose.[[42]](#footnote-42)

The convocation which sat with the Parliament was very active against the Puritans. The see of Canterbury being vacant, Bancroft, bishop of London, presided, and produced the king’s license to make canons.[[43]](#footnote-43) May 2, 1603, he delivered a book of canons, of his own preparing, to the lower house for their approbation. About the same time, Mr. Egerton, Fleetwood, Wotton, Clark, and other Puritan divines, presented a petition for reformation of the Book of Common Prayer, but instead of receiving it, they admonished them and their adherents to be obedient, and conform before midsummer-day, or else they should undergo the censures of the Church. In the meantime the canons were revising. May 23, there was a debate in the upper bouse upon the cross in baptism, when Bancroft and some others spoke vehemently for it, but Dr. Rudd, bishop of St. David’s, stood up and made the following speech for charity and moderation:

“For my part, I acknowledge the antiquity of the use of the cross, as mentioned in Tertullian, and after him in St. Cyprian, St. Chrysostom, Austin, and others. I also confess the original of the ceremony to have sprung by occasion of the pagans, who reproached the ancient Christians for believing in Christ crucified; and that in popery it has been superstitiously abused; and I affirm that it is in the Church of England now admitted and entertained by us, and restored to its ancient integrity, all superstition abandoned.

“Likewise, I wish that, if the king’s highness shall persist in imposing it, all would submit to it (as we do) rather than forego the ministry in that behalf. But I greatly fear, by the report which I hear, that very many learned preachers, whose consciences are not in our custody, nor to be disposed of at our devotion, will not easily be drawn thereunto; of which number, if any shall come in my walk, I desire to be furnished beforehand, by those that be present, with sufficient reasons to satisfy them (if it be possible) concerning some points which have been now delivered.

“First. Whereas sundry passages of Scripture have been alleged for the cross; as, ‘God forbid that I should rejoice save in the cross of Christ,’ and divers others of the like sense; if any of the adverse opinion fall into my company, and say that these scriptures are figurative, implying the death and passion of our Saviour Christ, and that to draw an argument from them to justify the sign of the cross in the forehead is an insufficient kind of reasoning, and a fallacy, what answer shall I make unto them?

“Secondly. Whereas I have observed, upon present relation, that the impugners of this ceremony were heard at large in the conference at Hampton Court, and having objected the example of Hezekiah, who broke in pieces the brazen serpent, after it had been abused to idolatry, and therefore the sign of the cross (which was not brought into the Church by God’s express command, as the brazen serpent was, but was from the beginning a mere invention of men) ought now to be taken away by reason of the superstitious abuse which is sustained in popery; they received answer, That King Hezekiah might have preserved it, abandoning the abuse of it, if it had pleased him, and, consequently, it is in the king’s majesty’s power to abolish this ceremony, having been abused, or to retain it in manner aforesaid. Hereunto I say, that I was one of the conference, yet I was not at that part of the conference where those that stood for reformation had access to the king’s majesty’s presence, and liberty to speak tor themselves; for that I, and some other of my brethren the bishops, were secluded from that day’s assembly; but I suppose it to be true, as it has formerly been reported, and I for my own particular admit the consequence put down above. Now, because I wish all others abroad as well satisfied herein as ourselves that be here present, if any of the contrary opinion shall come to me and say that the aforesaid answer does not satisfy them, because they think there is as great reason now to move them to become petitioners to his majesty for abolishing the cross in baptism as there was to move the godly zealous in Hezekiah’s time to be petitioners for defacing the brazen serpent, because the churchgoing papists now among us do superstitiously abuse the one, as the Israelites did the other; what sound answer shall I make to them for their better satisfaction?

“Thirdly. Whereas it has been this day alleged that it is convenient and necessary to preserve the memory of the cross of Christ by this means; if haply any of the other side shall come to me and say that the memory of the cross of Christ might be sufficiently and more safely preserved by preaching the doctrine of the Gospel, the sum whereof is ‘Christ crucified;’ which was so lively preached to the Galatians, as if his bodily image had been crucified among them; and yet we know not of any material or signal cross that was in use in the Church at that time; I desire to know what satisfaction or answer must be given to them?

“Moreover, I protest, that all my speeches now are uttered by way of proposition, not by way of opposition, and that they all tend to work pacification in the Church; for I put great difference between what is lawful and what is expedient, and between them that are schismatical and them that are scrupulous only upon some ceremonies, being otherwise learned, studious, grave, and honest men.

“Concerning these last, I suppose, if, upon the urging them to absolute subscription, they should be stiff, and choose rather to forego their livings, and the exercise of their ministry, though I do not justify their doings herein, yet surely their service will be missed at such a time, as need shall require us and them to give the right hand of fellowship one to another, and to go arm in arm against the common adversary.

“Likewise consider who must be the executioners of their deprivation; even we ourselves, the bishops, against whom there will be a great clamour of them and their dependants, and many others who are well affected towards them, whereby our persons will be in hazard to be brought into extreme dislike or hatred.

“Also remember, that when the Benjamites were all destroyed, saving six hundred, and the men of Israel sware in their fury that none of them would give his daughter to the Benjamites to wife, though they suffered for their just deserts, yet their brethren afterward lamented and said, There is one tribe cut off from Israel this day; and they used all their wits, to the uttermost of their policy, to restore that tribe again.

“In like sort, if these our brethren aforesaid shall be deprived of their places for the matter premised, I think we should find cause to bend our wits to the utmost extent of our skill to provide some cure of souls for them, that they may exercise their talents.

“Furthermore, if these men, being divers hundreds, should forsake their charges, who, I pray you, should succeed them? Verily, I know not where to find so many able preachers in this realm unprovided for; but suppose there were, yet they might more conveniently be settled in the seats of unpreaching ministers. But if they are put in the places of these men that arc dispossessed, thereupon it will follow, 1. That the number of preaching ministers will not be multiplied. 2. The Church cannot be so well furnished on a sudden; for though the new supply may be of learned men from the universities, yet will they not be such ready preachers for a time, nor so experienced in pastoral government, nor so well acquainted with the manners of the people, nor so discreet in their carriage, as those who have already spent many years in their ministerial charge.

“Besides, forasmuch as in the time of the late Archbishop of Canterbury these things were not so extremely urged, but that many learned preachers enjoyed their liberty conditionally, that they did not by word or deed openly disturb the state established, I would know a reason why they should now be so generally and exceedingly straitly called upon, especially since there is a greater increase of papists lately than heretofore.

“To conclude, I wish, that if by petition to the king’s majesty there cannot be obtained a quiet remove of the premises, nor yet a toleration for them that are of more staid and temperate carriage, yet at least there might be procured a mitigation of the penalty.”[[44]](#footnote-44)

The Bishops of London, Winchester, Ely, and Lincoln, answered the Bishop of St. David’s; but when his lordship would have replied, he was forbid by the president, and submitted; affirming, that as nothing was more dear to him than the peace of the Church, he was determined to use the best means he could to draw others to unity and conformity with himself, and the rest of his reverend brethren. And thus the debate ended.

The Book of Canons found an easy passage through both houses of convocation, and was afterward ratified by the king’s letters patent under his great seal; but not being confirmed by act of Parliament, it has several times been adjudged in the courts of Westminster Hall that they bind only the clergy, the laity not being represented in convocation. The book contains one hundred and forty-one articles, collected out of the injunctions, and other episcopal and synodical acts of the reigns of King Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth, and are the same that are now in force. By these we discern the spirit of the Church at this time, and how freely she dispensed her anathemas against those who attempted a farther reformation. The canons that relate to the Puritans deserve a particular mention, because (however illegally) they suffered severely under them.

“Canon 3 says, that whosoever shall affirm that the Church of England by law established is not a true and apostolical church, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto,* and not restored but only by the archbishop, after his repentance and public revocation of his wicked error.

“Canon 4. Whosoever shall affirm the form of God’s worship in the Church of England established by law, and contained in the Book of Common Prayer and administration of sacraments, is a corrupt, superstitious, and unlawful worship, or contains anything repugnant to Scripture, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto,* and not restored, &c.

“Canon 5. Whosoever shall affirm, that any of the thirty-nine articles of the Church, agreed upon in the year 1502, for avoiding diversity of opinions, and for establishing consent touching true religion, are in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe to, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto,* and not restored, &c.

“Canon 6. Whosoever shall affirm, that the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England by law established arc wicked, antichristian, superstitious, or such as, being commanded by lawful authority, good men may not with a good conscience approve, use, or, as occasion requires, subscribe, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto,* and not restored, &c.

“Canon 7. Whosoever shall affirm the government of the Church of England, by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, and the rest that bear office in the same, is antichristian, or repugnant to the Word of God, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto,* and not restored, &c.

“Canon 8. Whosoever shall affirm, that the form and manner of making and consecrating bishops, priests, or deacons, contain anything repugnant to the Word of God; or that persons so made and consecrated are not lawfully made, or need any other calling or ordination to their divine offices, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto,* and not restored, &c.

“Canon 9. Whosoever shall separate from the communion of the Church of England, as it is approved by the apostles’ rules, and combine together in a new brotherhood, accounting those who conform to the doctrines, rites, and ceremonies of the Church unmeet for their communion, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto,* and not restored, &c.

“Canon 10. Whosoever shall affirm that such ministers as refuse to subscribe to the form and number of God’s worship in the Church of England, and their adherents, may truly take to themselves the name of another church not established by law, and shall publish that their pretended church has groaned under the burden of certain grievances imposed on them by the Church of England, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto,* and not restored, &c.

“Canon 11. Whosoever shall affirm that there are within this realm other meetings, assemblies, or congregations, of the king’s born subjects, than such as are established by law, which may rightly challenge to themselves the name of true and lawful churches, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto,* and not restored, &c.

“Canon 12. Whosoever shall affirm that it is lawful for any sort of ministers or lay persons to make rules, orders, and constitutions, in causes ecclesiastical, without the king’s authority, and shall submit to be ruled and governed by them, let him be excommunicated *ipso facto,* and not restored, &c.

“Canon 93. We decree and appoint, that after any judge ecclesiastical hath proceeded judicially against obstinate and factious persons, for not observing the rites and ceremonies of the Church, or for contempt of public prayer, no judge *ad quem* shall admit or allow of an appeal, unless he having first seen the original appeal, the party appellant do first personally promise and vow that he will faithfully keep and observe all the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, as also the prescript form of common prayer; and do likewise subscribe the three articles formerly by us specified and declared.”

They who are acquainted with the terrible consequences of an excommunication in the spiritual courts, must be sensible of the new hardships put upon the Puritans by these canons: suspensions and deprivations from their livings were not now thought sufficient punishments for the sin of nonconformity; but the Puritans, both clergy and laity, must be turned out of the congregation of the faithful; they must be rendered incapable of suing for their lawful debts; they must be imprisoned for life by process out of the civil courts, or until they make satisfaction to the Church; and when they die, they must be denied Christian burial; and, so far as lies in the power of the court, be excluded the kingdom of heaven. O uncharitableness! Papists excommunicate Protestants, because, by renouncing the Catholic faith, they apprehended them guilty of heresy; but for Protestants of the same faith to excommunicate their fellow-Christians and subjects, and deprive them of their liberties, properties, and estates, for a few ceremonies, or because they have not the same veneration for the ecclesiastical constitution with themselves, is hardly to be paralleled.

To take notice of a few more of the canons: canon 14 forbids the minister to add to, or leave out, any part of the prayers. Canon 18 enjoins bowing at the name of Jesus. Canons 17, 24, 25, 58, 74, enjoin the wearing the habits in colleges, cathedrals, &c., as copes, surplices, hoods.

Canon 27 forbids giving the sacrament to schismatics, or to any other but such as kneel, and allow of the rites, ceremonies, and orders of the Church. Canon 28 says that none shall be admitted to the sacrament but in their own parish. Canon 29, That no parent shall be urged to be present, nor be admitted to answer as a godfather for his own child in baptism. Canon 30 declares the sign of the cross to be no part of the substance of the sacrament of baptism, but that the ordinance is perfect without it. Canon 33 prohibits ordination without a presentation, and says, that if any bishop ordain without a title, he shall maintain the person till he be provided with a living. Canons 36 and 37 say that no person shall be ordained, or suffered to preach, or catechise in any place as a lecturer, or otherwise, unless he first subscribe the three articles following: 1. That the king’s majesty is the supreme head and governor of this realm, as well in all spiritual and ecclesiastical as temporal causes. 2. That the Book of Common Prayer, &c., contains nothing contrary to the Word of God, and that he will use it, and none other. 3. That he alloweth the thirty-nine articles of 1562 to be all and every one of them agreeable to the Word of God. To these he shall subscribe in the following form of words:

I, N N, do willingly, and *ex animo,* subscribe to these three articles above mentioned, and to all things that are contained in them.

Canon 38 says, that if any minister, after subscription, shall disuse the ceremonies, he shall be suspended; then, after a month, be excommunicated; and after another month, be deposed from his ministry. Canon 55 contains the form of bidding prayer before sermon: “Ye shall pray for Christ’s holy Catholic Church,” &c., the original of which I have accounted for. Canon 82 appoints, “that convenient and decent tables shall be provided in all churches for the celebration of the holy communion, and the same tables shall be covered in times of Divine service with a carpet of silk, or other convenient stuff; and with a fair linen cloth at the time of the administration, as becometh that table, and so stand, saving when the said holy communion is to be administered; at which time the same shall be placed in so good sort within the church or chancel, as thereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants in his prayer and administration; and the communicants also more conveniently, and in more numbers, may communicate with the said minister; and a convenient seat shall be made for the minister to read service in.”

The other canons relate to the particular duties of ministers, lecturers, church-wardens, parish-clerks; to the jurisdiction and business of ecclesiastical courts, with their proper officers, as judges ecclesiastical, surrogates, proctors, registrars, apparitors, &c. The book concludes with denouncing the sentence of excommunication, 1. Against such as shall affirm that this synod, thus assembled, is not the true Church of England by representation. 2. Against such as shall affirm that persons not particularly assembled in this synod, either clergy or laity, are not subject to the decrees thereof, as not having given their voices to them. 3. Against such as shall affirm this sacred synod was a company of such persons as did conspire against godly and religious professors of the Gospel, and, therefore, that they and their proceedings ought to be despised and contemned, though ratiiied and confirmed by the royal supremacy and authority.

The king, in his ratification of these canons, commands them to be diligently observed and executed, and for the better observation of the same, that every parish minister shall read them over once every year in his church, on a Sunday or holyday, before Divine service; and all archbishops, bishops, and others having ecclesiastical jurisdiction, are commanded to see all and every the same put in execution, and not spare to execute the penalties in them severally mentioned on those that wilfully break or neglect them. I shall leave the reader to make his own comment on the proceedings of this synod, only observing that, when they had finished their decrees, they were prorogued to January, 1605-6, when, Dr Overal being prolocutor, they gave the king four subsidies, but did no more, church business till the time of their dissolution, in the year 1610.

Dr. Bancroft, bishop of London, being translated to the see of Canterbury[[45]](#footnote-45) [December 1604], was succeeded by Vaughan, bishop of Chester, a corpulent man, and of little activity; upon his advancement the Dutch and French ministers within his diocese presented him with an address for his protection and favour, wherein they set forth “that their churches were granted them by charter from pious King Edward VI., in the year 1550; and that, though they were again dispersed by the Marian persecution, they were restored to their churches and privileges by Queen Elizabeth, in the year 1558, from which time they have been in the uninterrupted possession of them. It appears from our records,’’ say they, “how kind and friendly the pious Grindal was to us; and what pains the prudent Bishop Sandys took in composing our differences. We promise ourselves the like favour from your lordship, &c., for whom we shall always pray,” &c.[[46]](#footnote-46) Monsieur de la Fontaine delivered the address, with a short Latin speech, to whom the bishop replied, “I thank you, most dear brethren, for your kind address; I am sensible of the merits of John Alasco, Utenhovius, and Edmund Grindal, bishop of London,[[47]](#footnote-47) superintendents of your churches, and of the rest of my predecessors in this bishopric, who had reason to take your churches, which are of the same faith with our own, under their patronage, which I am also ready to do. I have known your churches twenty-five years to have been beneficial to the kingdom, and serviceable to the Church of England, in which the devil, the author of discord, has kindled the fire of dissension, into which I pray you not to pour oil, but to endeavour by your councils and prayers to extinguish.”[[48]](#footnote-48) Thus the foreign churches enjoyed full peace, while his majesty’s own subjects, of the same faith and discipline with them, were harassed out of the kingdom.

Bancroft was a divine of a rough temper, a perfect creature of the prerogative, and a declared enemy of the religious and civil liberties of his country. He was for advancing the prerogative above law, and for enlarging the jurisdiction of the spiritual courts, by advising his majesty to take from the courts of Westminster Hall to himself the whole right of granting prohibitions; for this purpose he framed twenty-five grievances of the clergy, which he called *articuli cleri,* and presented them to the king for his approbation; but the judges having declared them to be contrary to law, they were set aside.

His grace revived the persecutions of the Puritans by enforcing the strict observance of all the festivals of the Church; reviving the use of copes, surplices, caps, hoods, &c., according to the first service-book of King Edward, obliging the clergy to subscribe over again to the three articles of Whitgift, which by the late canon [No. 36] they were to declare they did willingly, and from the heart. By these methods of severity above three hundred Puritan ministers[[49]](#footnote-49) were silenced or deprived, some of whom were excommunicated and cast into prison, others were forced to leave their native country and livelihood, and go into banishment to preserve their consciences. I say, says Mr. Collyer, to preserve their consciences, for it is a hard thing to bring everybody’s understanding to a common standard, and to make all honest men of the same mind.[[50]](#footnote-50)

To countenance and support the archbishop’s proceedings, the king summoned the twelve judges into the Star Chamber, and demanded their judgments upon three questions; there were present the Bishops of Canterbury and London, and about twelve lords of the privy council.

The lord-chancellor opened the assembly with **a** sharp speech against the Puritans, as disturbers of the peace, declaring that the king intend**ed** to suppress them by having the laws put in execution;[[51]](#footnote-51) and then demanded, in his majesty’s name, the opinion of the judges in three things:

Q. 1. “Whether the deprivation of Puritan ministers by the high commissioners, for refusing to conform to the ceremonies appointed by the last canons, was lawful?”

The judges replied, “that they had conferred thereof before, and held it to be lawful, because the king had the supreme ecclesiastical power, which he has delegated to the commissioners, whereby they have the power of deprivation, by the canon law of the realm, and the statute 1st Eliz., which appoints commissioners to be made **by** the queen, but does not confer any new pow**er,** but explain and declare the ancient power; and therefore they held it clear that the king without Parliament might make orders and constitutions for the government of the clergy, and might deprive them if they obeyed not; and so the commissioners might deprive them, but that the commissioners could not make any new constitutions without the king. And the divulging such ordinances by proclamation is a most gracious admonition. And forasmuch as they [the Puritans] have refused to obey, they are lawfully deprived by the commissioners *ex officio,* without libel, *et ore tenus convocati.*”

Q. 2. “Whether a prohibition be grantable against the commissioners upon the statute of **2** Henry V., if they do not deliver the copy of the libel to the party?”

The judges replied, “that that statute was intended where the ecclesiastical judge proceeds *ex officio, et ore tenus.”*

Q. 3. “Whether it be an offence punishable, and what punishment they deserved, who framed petitions, and collected a multitude of hands thereto, to prefer to the king in a public cause, as the Puritans had done, with an intimation to the king, that if he denied their suit, many thousands of his subjects would be discontented?”

The judges replied, “that it was an offence finable at discretion, and very near to treason and felony in the punishment, for it tended to theraising sedition, rebellion, and discontent among the people.” To which unaccountable resolution all the lords agreed.[[52]](#footnote-52)

By these determinations the whole body of the clergy are excluded the benefit of the common and statute law; for the king without Parliament may make what constitutions he pleases: his majesty’s high commissioners may proceed upon these constitutions *ex officio;* and the subject may not open his complaints to the king, or petition for relief, without being finable at pleasure, and coming within danger of treason or felony.[[53]](#footnote-53)

Before the breaking up of the assembly, some of the lords declared that the Puritans had raised a false rumour of the king, as intending to grant a toleration to papists; which offence the judges conceived to be heinously finable by the rules of common law, either in the King’s Bench, or by the king in council; or now, since the statute of 3 Henry VII., in the Star Chamber. And the lords severally declared that the king was discontented with the said false rumour, and had made but the day before a protestation to them that he never intended it, and that he would spend the last drop of blood in his body before he would do it; and prayed, that before any of his issue should maintain any other religion than what he truly possessed and maintained, God would take them out of the world. The reader will remember this solemn protestation hereafter.

After these determinations the archbishop resumed fresh courage, and pursued the Puritans without the least compassion. A more grievous persecution of the orthodox faith, says my author, is not to be met with in any prince’s reign. Dr. John Burgess, rector of Sutton Coldfield, in one of his letters to King James, says the number of Nonconformists in the counties he mentions were six or seven hundred, agreeable to the address of the Lincolnshire ministers, hereafter mentioned.[[54]](#footnote-54)

The whole clergy of London being summoned to Lambeth, in order to subscribe over again, many absconded, and such numbers refused, that the Church was in danger of being disfurnished, which awakened the court, who had been told that the Nonconformists were an inconsiderable body of men. Upon this surprising appearance, the bishops were obliged to relax the rigour of the canons for a while, and to accept of a promise from some to use the cross and surplice; from others to use the surplice only; and from others a verbal promise that they might be used, not obliging themselves to the use of them at all; the design of which was to serve the Church by them at present, till the universities could supply them with new men; for they had a strict eye upon those seminaries of learning, and would admit no young scholar into orders without an absolute and full subscription to all the articles and canons.

Bancroft, in a letter to his brethren the bishops, dated December 18, 1604, gives the following directions: “As to such ministers as are not already placed in the Church, the thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh canons are to be observed; and none are to be admitted to execute any ecclesiastical function without subscription. Such as are already placed in the Church are of two sorts: 1. Some promise conformity, but are unwilling to subscribe again. Of these, forasmuch as the near affinity between conformity and subscription gives apparent hopes that, being men of sincerity, they will in a short time frame themselves to a more constant course, and subscribe to that again, which by their practice they testify not to be repugnant to the Word of God, your lordship may (an act remaining upon record of such their offer and promise) respite their subscription for some short time. 2. Others, in their obstinacy, will yield neither to subscription nor promise of conformity; these are either stipendiary curates, or stipendiary lecturers, or men beneficed; the first two are to be silenced, and the third deprived.” He adds, “that the king’s proclamation of July 16, 1604, admonishes them to conform to the Church, and obey the same, or else to dispose of themselves and their families some other way, as being men unfit, for their obstinacy and contempt, to occupy such places; and besides, they are within the compass of several laws.”

The Puritans who separated from the Church, or inclined that way, were treated with yet greater rigour. Mr. Maunsel, minister of Yarmouth, and Mr. Lad, a merchant of that town, were imprisoned by the High Commission, for a supposed conventicle, because that on the Lord’s Day, after sermon, they joined with Mr. Tackler, their late minister, in repeating the heads of the sermon preached on that day in the church. Mr. Lad was obliged to answer upon oath certain articles without being able to obtain a sight of them beforehand, and, after he had answered before the chancellor, was cited up to Lambeth to answer them again before the high commissioners upon a new oath, which he refusing without a sight of his former answer, was thrown into prison, where he continued a long time without being admitted to bail. Mr. Maunsel, the minister, was charged farther with signing a complaint to the lower house of Parliament, and for refusing the oath *ex officio,* for which he also was shut up in prison without bail. At length, being brought to the bar upon a writ *of habeas corpus,* and having prevailed with Nic. Fuller, Esq., a bencher of Gray’s Inn, and a learned man in his profession, to be their counsel, he moved that the prisoners might be discharged, because the high commissioners were not empowered by law to imprison, or to administer the oath *ex officio,* or to fine any of his majesty’s subjects. This was reckoned an unpardonable crime, and, instead of serving his clients, brought the indignation of the commissioners upon himself. Bancroft told the king that he was the champion of the Nonconformists, and ought, therefore, to be made an example to terrify others from appearing for them; accordingly, he was shut up in close prison, from whence neither the intercession of his friends nor his own humble petitions could obtain his release to the day of his death.[[55]](#footnote-55)

This high abuse of Church power obliged many learned ministers and their followers to leave the kingdom and retire to Amsterdam, Rotterdam, the Hague, Leyden, Utrecht, and other places of the Low Countries, where English churches were erected after the Presbyterian model, and maintained by the States according to treaty with Queen Elizabeth, as the French and Dutch churches were in England. Besides, the English being yet in possession of the cautionary towns, many went over as chaplains to regiments, which, together with the merchants that resided in the trading cities, made a considerable body. The reverend and learned Dr. William Ames, one of the most acute controversial writers of his age, settled with the English church at the Hague; the learned Mr. Robert Parker, a Wiltshire divine, and author of the Ecclesiastical Policy, being disturbed by the High Commission, retired to Amsterdam, and afterward became chaplain to the English regiment at Doesburgh, where he died. The learned Mr. Forbes, a Scots divine, settled with the English church at Rotterdam, as Mr. Pots, Mr. Paget, and others did at Amsterdam and other places.

But the greatest number of those who left their native country for religion were Brownists,[[56]](#footnote-56) or rigid Separatists, of whom Mr. Johnson, Ainsworth, Smith, and Robinson were the leaders. Mr. Johnson erected a church at Amsterdam after the model of the Brownists, having the learned Mr. Ainsworth for doctor or teacher. These two published to the world a confession of faith of the people called Brownists, in the year 1602, not much different in doctrine from “The Harmony of Confessions,” but being men of warm spirits, they fell to pieces about points of discipline;[[57]](#footnote-57) Johnson excommunicated his own father and brother for trifling matters, after having rejected the mediation of the presbytery of Amsterdam. This divided the congregation, insomuch that Mr. Ainsworth and half the congregation excommunicated Johnson, who, after some time, returned the same compliment to Ainsworth. At length the contest grew so hot that Amsterdam could not hold them; Johnson and his followers removed to Embden, where soon after dying, his congregation dissolved. Nor did Mr. Ainsworth and his followers live long in peace, upon which he left them and retired to Ireland, where he continued some time; but when the spirits of his people were quieted he returned to Amsterdam, and continued with them to the day of his death. This Mr. Ainsworth was author of an excellent little treatise entitled “An Arrow against Idolatry,” and of a most learned commentary on the five books of Moses, by which he appears to have been a great master of the Oriental languages and of Jewish antiquities. His death was sudden, and not without suspicion of violence, for it is reported that, having found a diamond of very great value in the streets of Amsterdam, he advertised it in print, and when the owner, who was a Jew, came to demand it, he offered him any acknowledgment he would desire; but Ainsworth, though poor, would accept of nothing but a conference with some of his rabbis upon the prophecies of the Old Testament relating to the Messias, which the other promised, but not having interest enough to obtain it, and Ainsworth being resolute, it is thought he was poisoned.[[58]](#footnote-58) His congregation remained without a pastor for some years after his death, and then chose Mr. Canne, author of the marginal references to the Bible, and sundry other treatises.

Mr. Smith was a learned man, and of good abilities, but of an unsettled head, as appears by the preface to one of his books, in which he desires that his *last writings* may always be taken for his *present judgment.* He was for refining upon the Brownists’ scheme, and at last declared for the principles of the Baptists; upon this he left Amsterdam, and settled with his disciples at Ley; where, being at a loss for a proper administrator of the ordinance of baptism, he plunged himself, and then performed the ceremony upon others, which gained him the name of a Se-Baptist.[[59]](#footnote-59) He afterward embraced the tenets of Arminius, and published certain conclusions upon those points in the year 1611, which Mr. Robinson answered; but Smith died soon after, and his congregation dissolved.

It seems that the accusers of Mr. Smith have forgotten the *progressive nature* of the changes he underwent. “For a man,” he himself remarks, “if a Turk, to become a Jew, if a Jew, to become a papist, if a papist, to become a Protestant, are all commendable changes, though they all befall one and the same person in one year, nay, if it were in one month; so that *not to* change religion is evil simply; and, therefore, that we should fall from the profession of Puritanism to Brownism, and from Brownism to true Christian baptism, is not simply evil, or reprovable

Mr. John Robinson was a Norfolk divine, beneficed about Yarmouth, where being often molested by the bishop’s officers, and his friends almost ruined in the ecclesiastical courts, he removed to Leyden, and erected a congregation upon the model of the Brownists.[[60]](#footnote-60) He set out upon the most rigid principles, but by conversing with Dr. Ames, and other learned men, he became more moderate; and though he always maintained the lawfulness and necessity of separating from those Reformed churches among which he lived, yet he did not deny them to be true churches, and admitted their members to occasional communion, allowing his own to join with the Dutch churches in prayer and hearing the Word, but not in the sacraments and discipline, which gained him the character of a semi-separatist; his words are these:[[61]](#footnote-61) “We profess, before God and men, that we agree so entirely with the Reformed Dutch churches in matters of religion, that we are willing to subscribe to all and every one of their articles, as they are set down in ‘The Harmony of Confession.’ We acknowledge these Reformed churches for true and genuine: we hold communion with them as far as we can; those among us that understand the Dutch language frequent their sermons; and we administer the Lord’s Supper to such of their members as are known to us, and desire it occasionally.” This Mr. Robinson was the father of the Independents.

Mr. Henry Jacob was born in Kent, and educated in St. Mary’s Hall, where he took the degrees in arts, entered into holy orders, and became precentor of Christ Church College, and afterward beneficed in his own country at Cheriton.[[62]](#footnote-62) He was a person thoroughly versed in theological authors, but withal a most zealous Puritan. He wrote two treatises against Fr. Johnson, the Brownist, in defence of the Church of England’s being a true church, printed at Middleburgh, 1599, and afterward published “Reasons taken out of God’s Word, and the best Human Testimonies, proving a Necessity of reforming our Churches of England, Ac., 1604.”[[63]](#footnote-63) But going to Leyden, and conversing with Mr. Robinson, he embraced his sentiments of discipline and government, and transplanted it into England in the year 1616, as will be seen in its proper place.

This difference among the Puritans engaged them in a warm controversy among themselves about the lawfulness and necessity of separating from the Church of England, while the conforming clergy stood by as spectators of the combat. Most of the Puritans were for keeping within the pale of the Church, apprehending it to be a true church in its doctrines and sacraments, though defective in discipline, and corrupt in ceremonies, but being a true church, they thought it not lawful to separate, though they could hardly continue in it with a good conscience. They submitted to suspensions and deprivations; and when they were driven out of one diocese, took sanctuary in another, being afraid of incurring the guilt of schism by forming themselves into separate communions. Whereas the Brownists maintained that the Church of England, in its present constitution, was no true Church of Christ, but a limb of antichrist, or at best a mere creature of the state; that their ministers were not rightly called and ordained, nor the sacraments duly administered; or, supposing it to be a true church, yet as it was owned by their adversaries [the conforming Puritans] to be a very corrupt one, it must be as lawful to separate from it as for the Church of England to separate from Rome. The conforming Puritans evaded this consequence by denying the Church of Rome to be a true church; nay, they affirmed it to be the very antichrist; but the argument remained in full force against the bishops, and that part of the clergy who acknowledged the Church of Rome to be a true church.

It is certainly as lawful to separate from the corruptions of one church as of another; and it is necessary to do so, when those corruptions are imposed as terms of communion. Let us hear Archbishop Laud, in his conference with the Jesuit Fisher. “Another church,” says his grace, “may separate from Rome, if Rome will separate from Christ; and so far as it separates from him and the faith, so far may another church separate from it. I grant the Church of Rome to be a true church in essence, though corrupt in manners and doctrine. And corruption of manners, attended with errors in the doctrines of faith, is a just cause for one particular church to separate from another.” His grace then adds, with regard to the Church of Rome: “The cause of the separation is yours, for you thrust us from you, because we called for truth and redress of abuses; for a schism must needs be theirs whose the cause of it is; the wo runs full out of the mouth of Christ, even against him that gives the offence, not against him that takes it. It was ill done of those, whoever they were, who first made the separation [from Rome]; I mean not actual, but casual, for, as I said before, the schism is theirs whose the cause of it is; and he makes the separation who gives the first just cause of it, not he that makes an actual separation upon a just cause preceding.” Let the reader carefully consider these concessions, and then judge how far they will justify the separation of the Brownists, or the Protestant Nonconformists at this day.

This year [1605] was famous for the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot, which was a contrivance of the papists to blow up the king and the whole royal family, with the chief of the Protestant nobility and gentry, November 5th, the first day of their assembling in Parliament. For this purpose a cellar was hired under the House of Lords, and stored with thirty-six barrels of gunpowder, covered over with coals and fagots; but the plot was discovered the night before, by means of a letter sent to Lord Monteagle, advising him to absent himself from the. house, because they were to receive a terrible blow, and not to know who hurt them. Monteagle carrying the letter to court, the king ordered the apartments about the Parliament House to be searched; the powder was found under the House of Lords, and Guy Faux with a dark lantern in the cellar, waiting to set fire to the train when the king should come to the house the next morning. Faux being apprehended, confessed the plot, and impeached several of his accomplices, eight of whom were tried and executed, and among them Garnet, provincial of the English Jesuits, whom the pope afterward canonized.

The discovery of this murderous conspiracy was ascribed to the royal penetration;[[64]](#footnote-64) but Mr. Osborne,[[65]](#footnote-65) and others, with great probability, say that the first notice of it came from Henry IV., king of France, who heard of it from the Jesuits, and that the letter to Monteagle was an artifice of Cecil’s, who was acquainted beforehand with the proceedings of the conspirators, and suffered them to go to their full length. Even Heylin says that the king and his council mined with them, and undermined them, and by so doing blew up their whole invention.[[66]](#footnote-66) But it is agreed on all hands, that if the plot had taken place, it was to have been fathered upon the Puritans; and, as if the king was in the secret, his majesty, in his speech to the Parliament November 9th, takes particular care to bring them into reproach; for, after having cleared the Roman Catholic religion from encouraging such murderous practices, he adds, the cruelty of the Puritans was worthy of fire, that would not allow salvation to any papists. So that, if these unhappy people had been blown up, his majesty thinks they would have had their deserts. Strange! that a Puritan should be so much worse than a papist, or deserve to be burned for uncharitableness, when his majesty knew that the papists were so much more criminal in this respect than they, not only denying salvation to the Puritans, but to all who are without the pale of their own church. But what was all this to the plot? except it was to turn off the indignation of the people from the papists, whom the king both feared and loved, to the Puritans, who, in a course of forty years’ sufferings, had never moved the least sedition against the state, but who would not be the advocates or dupes of an unbounded prerogative!

The discovery of this plot occasioned the drawing up the oath of allegiance, or of submission and obedience to the king as a temporal sovereign, independent of any other power upon earth; which quickly passed both houses, and was appointed to be taken by all the king’s subjects; this oath is distinct from the oath of supremacy, which obliges the subject to acknowledge his majesty to be supreme head of the Church as well as the State, and might therefore be taken by all such Roman Catholics as did not believe the pope had power to depose kings, and give away their dominions. Accordingly, Blackwell, their superior, and most of the English Catholics, submitted to the oath, though the pope absolutely forbade them on pain of damnation; which occasioned a new debate, concerning the extent of the pope’s power in temporals, between the learned of both religions. Cardinal Bellarmine, under the feigned name of Tortus, wrote against the oath, which gave occasion to King James’s Apology to all Christian Princes; wherein, after clearing himself from the charge of persecuting the papists, he reproaches his holiness with ingratitude, considering the free liberty of religion that he had granted the papists, the honours he had conferred on them, the free access they had to his person at all times, the general jail delivery of all Jesuits and papists convict, and the strict orders he had given his judges not to put the laws in execution against them for the future.[[67]](#footnote-67) All which was true, while the unhappy Puritans were imprisoned and fined, or forced into banishment. The Parliament, on occasion of this plot, appointed an annual thanksgiving on the 5th of November, and passed another law, obliging all persons to come to church under the penalty of twelve pence every Sunday they were absent, unless they gave such reasons as should be satisfactory to a justice of the peace. This, like a two-edged sword, cut down all Separatists, whether Protestants or papists.

To return to the Puritans; the more moderate of whom, being willing to steer a middle course, between a total separation and absolute conformity, were attacked by some of the bishops with this argument:

“All those who wilfully refuse to obey the king in all things indifferent, and to conform themselves to the orders of the Church authorized by him, not contrary to the Word of God, are schismatics, enemies to the king’s supremacy and the state, and not to be tolerated in church or commonwealth.

“But you do so—

“Therefore, you are not to be tolerated in church or commonwealth.”

The Puritans denied the charge, and returned this argument upon their accusers:

“All those who freely and willingly perform to the king and state all obedience, not only in things necessary, but indifferent, commanded by law, and that have been always ready to conform themselves to every order of the Church authorized by him, not contrary to the Word of God, are free from all schism, friends to the king’s supremacy, and to the state, and unworthy in this manner to be molested in church or commonwealth.

“But there are none of us that are deprived or suspended from our ministry, but have been ever ready to do all this; therefore we are free from schism, friends to the king’s supremacy, and most unworthy of such molestation as we sustain.”

This being the point of difference, the Puritans offered a public disputation upon the lawfulness of imposing ceremonies in general; and in particular upon the surplice, the cross in baptism, and kneeling at the communion; but were refused. Upon which, the Lincolnshire ministers drew up an apology for those ministers who are troubled for refusing of subscription and conformity, and presented it to the king, December 1, 1604, the abridgment of which is now before me, and begins with a declaration of their readiness to subscribe the first of the three articles required by the thirty-sixth canon, concerning the king’s supremacy; but to the other two, say they, we cannot subscribe, because we are persuaded that both the Book of Common Prayer, and the other book [of Articles] to be subscribed by this canon (which yet, in some respects, we reverently esteem), contain in them sundry things which are not agreeable, but contrary to the Word of God.

They object to the Book of Common Prayer, in general, That it appoints that order for reading the Holy Scriptures which in many respects is contrary to the Word of God. As,

1. “The greatest part of the canonical Scripture is left out in the public reading; whereas ‘all Scripture is given by inspiration, and is profitable,’ &c., and sundry chapters that are, in their opinion, more edifying than some others that arc read, are omitted.

2. “It does too much honour to the Apocryphal writings, commanding many of them to be read for first lessons, and under the name of Holy Scriptures, and in as great a proportion; for of the canonical chapters of the Old ‘I’estament (being in all seven hundred and seventy-nine) are read only five hundred and ninety-two, and of the Apocryphal books (being one hundred and seventy-two chapters) are read one hundred and four. This they apprehend to be contrary to the Word of God, forasmuch as the Apocryphal books contain sundry and manifest errors, divers of which are here produced.

3, 4, 5, 6, 7. “The Book of Common Prayer appoints such a translation of the Holy Scriptures to be read in the churches as in some places is absurd, and in others takes from, perverts, obscures, and falsifies the Word of God; examples of which are produced with the authorities of the most considerable reformers.”

Their next general objection against subscribing the Book of Common Prayer is, because it enjoins the use of such ceremonies as they apprehend contrary to the Word of God.

To make good this assertion, they say,[[68]](#footnote-68) “It is contrary to the Word of God to use (much more to command the use of) such ceremonies in the worship of God as man hath devised, if they be notoriously known to be abused to idolatry and superstition by the papists, and are of no necessary use in the Church. Here they cite such passages of Scripture as command the Jews to abolish all instruments of idolatry, and even to cast away such things as had a good original, when once they are known to have been abused to idolatry; as images, groves, and the brazen serpent, 2 Kings, xviii., 11. They produce, farther, the testimonies of sundry fathers, as Eusebius, St. Austin, &c., and of the most considerable moderns, as Calvin, Bucer, Musculus, Peter Martyr, Beza, Zanchy; Bishop Jewel, Pilkington, Bilson; Dr. Humphreys, Fulk, Andrews, Sutcliffe, and others, against conformity with idolaters.”

With regard to the three ceremonies in question, they allege they have all been abused by the papists to superstition and idolatry.

1. “The surplice[[69]](#footnote-69) has been thus abused, for it is one of those vestments without which nothing can be consecrated; all priests that are present at mass must wear it, and, therefore, the use of it in the Church has been condemned, not only by foreign divines, but by Bishop Hooper, Farrar, Jewel, Pilkington, Rogers, and others among ourselves.”

2. “The cross has been also abused to superstition and idolatry, to drive away devils, to expel diseases, to break the force of witchcraft, &c. It is one of the images to which the papists give religious adoration. The water in baptism has no spiritual virtue in it without the cross, nor is any one rightly baptized (according to the papists) without it.”

3. “Kneeling at the sacrament has been no less abused; it arose from the notion of the transubstantiation of the elements, and is still used by the papists in the worship of their breaden God; who admit they would be guilty of idolatry in kneeling before the elements if they did not believe them to be the real body and blood of Christ. This ceremony was not introduced into the Church till antichrist was at its full height; and there is no action in the whole service that looks so much like idolatry as this.”

Their second argument[[70]](#footnote-70) for the unlawfulness of the ceremonies is taken from their mystical signification, which gives them the nature of a sacrament. Now, no sacrament ought to be of man’s devising; the ceremonies, therefore, being affirmed in the Book of Common Prayer to be significant, are unlawful.

Their third argument[[71]](#footnote-71): is taken from the unlawfulness of imposing them as parts of God’s worship, which they prove from hence, “That God is the only appointer of his own worship, and condemns all human inventions, so far forth as they are made parts of it. Now all the ceremonies in question are thus imposed, for Divine service is supposed not to be rightly performed without the surplice, nor baptism rightly administered without the cross, nor the Lord’s Supper but to such as kneel; and, therefore, they are unlawful.”

Their fourth is taken from hence, That no rites or ecclesiastical orders should be ordained or used but such as are needful and profitable, and for edification; and, especially, that none shall be ordained or used that cause offence and hinder edification[[72]](#footnote-72) (Rom. xvi. 21; 1 Cor. x. 23, 32). “Now the ceremonies in question are neither needful nor profitable, nor do they tend to edification; but, on the contrary, have given great offence, as appears from hence, that very many of the learned and best experienced ministers in the land have chosen rather to suffer any trouble than yield to the use of them; and we doubt not to affirm that the greatest number of resident, able, and godly ministers in the land at this day do in their consciences dislike them, and judge them needless and unfit, as appears by the list of nonsubscribers already mentioned [p. 44], besides many more who, though unwilling in some other respects to join in the petition, did profess their hearty desire to have them removed.[[73]](#footnote-73) And if the rest of the shires be esteemed according to this proportion, it will easily appear that the greatest number of the resident, preaching, and fruitful ministers of the land do dislike them. This may yet farther appear, by their seldom using them for many years past, and their great unwillingness to yield to the use of them now. If they thought them needful or profitable, why do they neglect them in their public ministry, being commanded by lawful authority? Besides, those very bishops that have been most hot in urging the ceremonies have declared that the Church might well be without them, and have wished them taken away; as Archbishop Whitgift, in his defence of the answer to Cartwright’s Admonition, p. 259; Dr. Chadderton, bishop of Lincoln, in his speech before all the ministers, convened before him at Huntingdon, November 30th, 1604; and others in ecclesiastical dignities have spoken vehemently against them as things that do not edify, nor have any tendency to promote decency or order.

“With regard to the surplice, they produce the testimonials of the learned Bucer, Peter Martyr, Beza, Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, and others, for the expediency of it, even though they submitted to wear it. Bucer says he could be content to suffer some grievous loss or pain in his body, upon condition the surplice might be abolished.

“The like authorities are brought against the cross, and against kneeling at the communion, the former being a mere invention of man, neither taught by Christ nor his apostles, and the latter being apparently different from the first institution, they receiving it in a table posture; and it is gross hypocrisy (say they) for us to pretend more holiness, reverence, and devotion, in receiving the sacrament, than the apostles, who received it from the immediate hand and person of Christ himself. They (to be sure) had the corporeal presence of Christ, and yet did not kneel; why, then, should it be enjoined in the Church, when the corporeal presence of Christ is withdrawn? This has been thought an argument of great force by our chief divines, as Calvin, Bullinger, Beza, Chemnitius, Bishop Pilkington, Willet, and others, who declare strongly for the posture of sitting, or at most standing, at the communion.

“Besides, kneeling at the sacrament is of very late antiquity, and was not introduced into the Church till antichrist was in his full height; the primitive Christians (according to Tertullian) thought it unlawful to kneel at prayer on the lord’s Day; and the first Council of Nice, Ann. Dom. 327, made a solemn decree that none might pray kneeling, but only standing, on the Lord’s Day, because on that day is celebrated the joyful remembrance of our Lord’s resurrection. To kneel is a gesture of sorrow and humiliation; whereas, he that prays standing shows himself thankful for the obtaining some mercy or favour. So that either the primitive Church used a gesture of greater reverence and humility at the sacrament, which is a feast, and a joyful remembrance of the death of Christ, than they did at prayer, or else they received it in another posture. Besides, it is said[[74]](#footnote-74) that the ancient councils commanded that ‘no man should kneel down at the communion, fearing it should be an occasion of idolatry.’ Mr. Fox,[[75]](#footnote-75) speaking of the usage of the primitive Church, says they had the communion, not at an altar, but at a plain table of boards, when the whole congregation together did communicate, with reverence and thanksgiving; not lifting over the priest’s bead, nor worshipping, nor kneeling, nor knocking their breasts, but either sitting at supper, or standing after supper. Eusebius,[[76]](#footnote-76) speaking of a man that had been admitted to the communion, says he stood at the table and put forth his hand to receive the holy food. And Bishop Jewel says, that in St. Basil’s days [ann. 380] the communion-table was of boards, and so placed that men might stand round it, and that every man was bound by an apostolical tradition to stand upright at the communion.

“Besides, the gesture of kneeling is contrary to the very nature of the Lord’s Supper, which is ordained to be a banquet and sign of that sweet familiarity that is between the faithful and him, and of that spiritual nourishment we are to receive by feeding on his body and blood by faith: and in what nation is it thought decent to kneel at banquets? Where do men eat and drink upon their knees? Farther, the disposition of mind at the Lord’s Table is not so much humility as assurance of faith, and cheerful thankfulness for the benefits of Christ’s death. For these reasons, and because kneeling at the sacrament had an idolatrous original, and has a tendency to lead men into that sin, they think it unlawful, and to be laid aside.”

The Abridgment concludes with a short table of sundry other exceptions against the three books whereunto they are required to subscribe, which they purpose to justify and confirm in the same manner as they have done in respect of those contained in this book; a summary whereof we shall meet with hereafter.

The Abridgment was answered by Bishop Moreton and Dr. Burges, who, after having suffered himself to be deprived for nonconformity, June 19, 1604, was persuaded by King James to conform, and write in defence of his present conduct against his former arguments. Bishop Moreton endeavours to defend the innocency of the three ceremonies from Scripture, antiquity, the testimony of Protestant divines, and the practice of the Nonconformists themselves in other cases, and has said as much as can be said in favour of them; though it is hard to defend the imposing them upon those who esteem them unlawful, or who apprehend things indifferent ought to be left in the state that Christ left them. Dr. Downham, Sparkes, Covel, Hutton, Rogers, and Ball, wrote for the ceremonies; and were answered by Mr. Bradshaw, Mr. Paul Baynes, Dr. Ames, and others.

From the arguments of these divines, it appears that the Puritans were removing to a greater distance from the Church; for whereas, says Dr. Burges, Mr. Cartwright and his brethren wrote sharply against the ceremonies as inconvenient, now they arc opposed as absolutely unlawful, neither to be imposed nor used. The cruel severities of Bancroft and the high commissioners were the occasion of this; for being pushed upon one of these extremes, either to a constant and full conformity, or to lay down their ministry in the Church, many of them, at one of their conferences, came to this conclusion, that if they could not enjoy their livings without subscribing over again the three articles above mentioned, and declaring, at the same time, they did it willingly and from their hearts, it was their duty to resign. These were called brethren of the second separation, who were content to join with the Church in her doctrines and sacraments, though they apprehended it unlawful to declare their hearty approbation of the ceremonies; and if their conduct was grounded on a conviction that it was their duty as Christians to bear their testimony against all unscriptural impositions in the worship of God, it must deserve the commendation of all impartial and consistent Protestants. No men could go greater lengths for the sake of peace than they were willing to do: for in their defence of the ministers’ reasons for refusal of subscription to the Book of Common Prayer against the cavils of F. Hutton, B.D., Dr. Covel, and Dr. Sparkes, published 1607, they begin thus: “We protest before the Almighty God, that we acknowledge the churches of England, as they be established by public authority, to be true visible churches of Christ; that we desire the continuance of our ministry in them above all earthly things, as that without which our whole life would be wearisome and bitter to us; that we dislike not a set form of prayer to be used in our churches; nor do we write with an evil mind to deprave the Book of Common Prayer, Ordination, or Book of Homilies; but to show our reasons why we cannot subscribe to all things contained in them.”

These extreme proceedings of the bishops strengthened the hands of the Brownists in Holland, who with great advantage declared against the lawfulness of holding communion with the Church of England at that time, not only because it was a corrupt church, but a persecuting one. On the other hand, the younger divines in the Church, who preached for preferment, painted the Separatists in the most odious colours, as heretics, schismatics, fanatics, precisians, enemies to God and the king, and of unstable minds. The very same language which the papists had used against the first Reformers.

To remove these reproaches, and to inform the world of the real principles of the Puritans of these times, the Reverend M. Bradshaw published a small treatise, entitled “English Puritanism, containing the main Opinions of the rigidest sort of those that went by that Name in the Realm of England,” which the learned Dr. Arnes translated into Latin for the benefit of foreigners. The reader will learn by the following abstract of it the true state of their case, as well as the near affinity between the principles of the ancient and modern Nonconformists.[[77]](#footnote-77)

CHAPTER I.

*Concerning Religion in General.*

1. “The Puritans hold and maintain the absolute perfection of the Holy Scriptures, both as to faith and worship; and that whatsoever is enjoined as a part of Divine service that cannot be warranted by the said Scriptures, is unlawful.

2. “That all inventions of men, especially such as have been abused to idolatry, are to be excluded out of the exercises of religion.

3. “That all outward means instituted to express and set forth the inward worship of God are parts of Divine worship, and ought, therefore, evidently to be prescribed by the Word of God.

4. “To institute and ordain any mystical rites or ceremonies of religion, and to mingle the same with the Divine rites and ceremonies of God’s ordinance, is gross superstition.”

CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the Church.*

1. “They hold and maintain that every congregation or assembly of men, ordinarily joining together in the true worship of God, is a true visible Church of Christ.

2. “That all such churches are in all ecclesiastical matters equal, and by the Word of God, ought to have the same officers, administrations, orders, and forms of worship.

3. “That Christ has not subjected any church, or congregation to any other superior ecclesiastical jurisdiction than to that which is within itself, so that if a whole church or congregation should err in any matters of faith or worship, no other churches or spiritual officers have power to censure or punish them, but are only to counsel and advise them.

4. “That every church ought to have her own spiritual officers and ministers resident with her; and those such as are enjoined by Christ in the New Testament, and no other.

5. “That every church ought to have liberty to choose their own spiritual officers.

6. “That if particular churches err in this choice, none but the civil magistrate has power to control them, and oblige them to make a better choice.

7. “That ecclesiastical officers or ministers in one church ought not to bear any ecclesiastical office in another; and they are not to forsake their calling without just cause, and such as may be approved by the congregation: but if the congregation will not hearken to reason, they are then to appeal to the civil magistrate, who is bound to procure them justice.

8. “That a church having chosen its spiritual governors, ought to live in all canonical obedience to them, agreeably to the Word of God; and if any of them be suspended, or unjustly deprived, by other ecclesiastical officers, they are humbly to pray the magistrate to restore them; and if they cannot obtain it, they are to own them to be their spiritual guides to the death, though they are rigorously deprived of their ministry and service.

9. “That the laws and orders of the churches warranted by the Word of God are not repugnant to civil government, whether monarchical, aristocratical, or democratical; and we renounce all jurisdiction that is repugnant or derogatory to any of these, especially to the monarchy of this kingdom.”

CHAPTER III.

*Concerning the Ministers of the Word.*

1. “They hold that the pastors of particular congregations are the highest spiritual officers in the church, over whom there is no superior pastor by Divine appointment but Jesus Christ.

2. “That there are not by Divine institution, in the Word, any ordinary, national, provincial, or diocesan pastors to whom the pastors of particular churches are to be subject.

3. “That no pastor ought to exercise or accept of any civil jurisdiction or authority, but ought to be wholly employed in spiritual offices and duties to that congregation over which he is set.

4. “That the supreme office of the pastor is to preach the Word publicly to the congregation; and that the people of God ought not to acknowledge any for their pastors that are not able, by preaching, to interpret and apply the Word of God to them; and, consequently, all ignorant and mere reading priests are to be rejected.

5. “That in public worship the pastor only is to be the mouth of the congregation to God in prayer; and that the people are only to testify their assent by the word *Amen.*

6. “That the Church has no power to impose upon her pastors or officers any other ceremonies or injunctions than what Christ has appointed.

7. “That in every church there should also be a doctor to instruct and catechise the ignorant in the main principles of religion.”

CHAPTER IV.

*Concerning the Elders.*

1. “They hold that by God’s ordinance the congregation should choose other officers as assistants to the ministers in the government of the church, who are jointly with the ministers to be overseers of the manners and conversation of all the congregation.

2. “That these are to be chosen out of the gravest and most discreet members, who are also of some note in the world, and able, if possible, to maintain themselves.”

CHAPTER V.

*Of Church Censures.*

1. “They hold that the spiritual keys of the Church are committed to the aforesaid spiritual officers and governors, and to none others.

2. “That by virtue of these keys they are not to examine and make inquisition into the hearts of men, nor molest them upon private suspicions or uncertain fame, but to proceed only upon open and notorious crimes. If the offender be convinced, they ought not to scorn, deride, taunt, and revile him with contumelious language, nor procure proctors to make personal invectives against him, nor make him give attendance from term to term, and from one court-day to another, of the manner of our ecclesiastical courts; but to use him brotherly, and, if possible, to move him to repentance; and if he repent, they are not to proceed to censure, but to accept his hearty sorrow and contrition as a sufficient satisfaction to the church, without imposing any fines, or taking fees, or enjoining any outward mark of shame, as the white sheet, &c.

“But if the offender be obstinate, and show no signs of repentance, and if his crime be fully proved upon him, and be of such a high nature as to deserve a censure according to the Word of God, then the ecclesiastical officers, with the free consent of the whole congregation (and not otherwise), are first to suspend him from the sacrament, praying for him, at the same time, that God would give him repentance to the acknowledgment of his fault; and if this does not humble him, they are then to denounce him to be as yet no member of the kingdom of heaven, and of that congregation, and so are to leave him to God and the king. And this is all the ecclesiastical jurisdiction that any spiritual officers are to use against any man for the greatest crime that can be committed.

“If the party offending be a civil superior, they are to behave towards him with all that reverence and civil subjection that his honour or high office in the state may require. They are not to presume to convene him before them, but arc themselves to go to him in all civil and humble manner, to stand bareheaded, to bow, to give him all his civil titles; and if it be a supreme governor or king, to kneel, and in most humble manner to acquaint him with his faults; and if such or any other offenders will voluntarily withdraw from the communion, they have no farther concern with them.

“They hold the oath *ex officio* on the imposer’s part to be most damnable and tyrannous, against the very law of nature, devised by antichrist, through the inspiration of the devil, to tempt weak Christians to perjure themselves, or be drawn in to reveal to the enemies of Christianity those secret religious acts which, though done for the advancement of the Gospel, may bring on themselves and their dearest friends heavy sentences of condemnation from court.”

CHAPTER VI.

*Concerning the Civil Magistrate.*

1. “They hold that the civil magistrate ought to have supreme civil[[78]](#footnote-78) power over all the churches within his dominions; but that, as he is a Christian, he ought to be a member of some one of them; which is not in the least derogatory to his civil supremacy.

2. “That all ecclesiastical officers are punishable by the civil magistrate for the abuse of their ecclesiastical offices; and much more if they intrude upon the rights and prerogatives of the civil authority.

3. “They hold the pope to be antichrist, because he usurps the supremacy over kings and princes; and therefore all that defend the popish faith, and that are for tolerating that religion, are secret enemies of the king’s supremacy.

4. “That all archbishops, bishops, deans, officials, &c., hold their offices and functions at the king’s pleasure, merely *jure humano;* and whosoever holdeth that the king may not remove them, and dispose of them at his pleasure, is an enemy to his supremacy.”

Let the reader now judge whether there was sufficient ground for the calumny and reproach that were cast upon the Puritans of those times; but their adversaries having often charged them with denying the supremacy, and with claiming a sort of jurisdiction over the king himself, they published another pamphlet this summer, entitled “A Protestation of the King’s Supremacy, made in the Name of the afflicted Ministers, and opposed to the shameful Calumniations of the Prelates.” To which was annexed a humble petition for liberty of conscience. In their protestation, they declare,

1. “We hold and maintain the king’s supremacy in all causes, and over all persons, civil and ecclesiastical, as it was granted to Queen Elizabeth, and explained in the Book of Injunctions; nor have any of us been unwilling to subscribe and swear to it. We believe it to be the king’s natural right without a statute law, and that the churches within his dominions would sin damnably if they did not yield it to him. Nay, we believe that the king cannot alienate it from his crown, or transfer it to any spiritual potentates or rulers; and that it is not tied to his faith or Christianity, but to his very crown: so that if he were an infidel, the supremacy is his due.

2. “We hold that no church officers have power to deprive the king of any branch of his royal prerogative, much less of his supremacy, which is inseparable from him.

3. “That no ecclesiastical officers have power over the bodies, lives, goods, or liberties of any person within the king’s dominions.

4. “That the king may make laws for the good ordering of the churches within his dominions; and that the churches ought not to be disobedient, unless they apprehend them contrary to the Word of God; and even in such case they are not to resist, but peaceably to forbear obedience, and submit to the punishment, if mercy cannot be obtained.

5. “That the king only hath power within his dominions to convene synods or general assemblies of ministers, and by his authority royal to ratify and give life to their canons and constitutions, without whose ratification no man can force any subject to yield obedience to the same.

6. “That the king ought not to be subject to the censures of any churches, church officers, or synods, whatsoever; but only to that church, and those officers of his own court and household with whom he shall voluntarily join in communion, where there can be no fear of unjust usage.

7. “If a king, after he has held communion with a Christian church, should turn apostate, or live in a course of open defiance to the laws of God and religion, the church governors are to give over their spiritual charge and tuition of him, which, by calling from God and the king, they did undertake; and more than this they may not do, for the king still retains his supreme authority over the churches as entirely, and in as ample a manner, as if he were the most Christian prince in the world.

8. “We refuse no obedience to the king, nor to any of the canons required by the prelates, but such as we are willing to take upon our consciences, and to swear, if required, that we believe contrary to the Word of God. We deny no ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the king but that which Christ has appropriated to himself, who is the sole doctor and legislator of his Church.

9. “We arc so far from claiming any supremacy to ourselves, that we exclude from ourselves all secular pomp and power, holding it a sin to punish men in their bodies, goods, liberties, or lives, for any merely spiritual offence.

10. “We confine all ecclesiastical jurisdiction within one congregation, and that jurisdiction is not alone in the ministers, but also in the elders of the church; and their jurisdiction is merely spiritual.

“Therefore all that we crave of his majesty and the state is, that, with his and their permission, it maybe lawful for us to worship God according to his revealed will; and that we may not be forced to the observance of any human rites and ceremonies. We are ready to make an open confession of our faith and form of worship, and desire that we may not be obliged to worship God in corners, but that our religious and civil behaviour may be open to the observation and censure of the civil government, to whom we profess all due subjection. So long as it shall please the king and Parliament to maintain the hierarchy or prelacy in this kingdom, we are content that they enjoy their state and dignity; and we will live as brethren among those ministers that acknowledge spiritual homage to their spiritual lordships, paying to them all temporal duties of tithes, &c., and joining with them in the service and worship of God, so far as we may without our own particular communicating in those human traditions which we judge unlawful. Only we pray that the prelates and their ecclesiastical officers may not be our judges, but that we may both of us stand at the bar of the civil magistrate; and that if we shall be openly vilified and slandered, it may be lawful for us, without fear of punishment, to justify ourselves to the world; and then we shall think our lives, and all that we have, too little to spend in the service of our king and country.”

Though the principles of submission are here laid down with great latitude, and though the practice of the Puritans was agreeable to them, yet their enemies did not fail to charge them with disloyalty, with sedition, and with disturbing the peace of the state. Upon which the ministers of Devon and Cornwall published another small treatise, entitled “A Removal of certain Imputations laid upon the Ministers,” &c., in which they say, p. 21, “Let them [the bishops] sift well our courses since his majesty’s happy entrance in among us, and let them name wherein we have done aught that may justly be said ill to become the ministers of Jesus Christ. Have we drawn any sword? have we raised any tumult? have we used any threats? hath the state been put into any fear or hazard through us? Manifold disgraces have been cast upon us, and we have endured them; the liberty of our ministry hath been taken from us, and (though with bleeding hearts) we have sustained it. We have been cast out of our bouses, and deprived of our ordinary maintenance, yet have we blown no trumpet of sedition. These things have gone very near us, and yet did we never so much as entertain a thought of violence. The truth is, we have petitioned the king and state; and who hath reason to deny us that liberty? we have craved of the prelates to deal with us according to law; and is not this the common benefit of every subject? we have besought them to convince our consciences by Scripture. Alas! what would they have us to do? will they have us content ourselves with this only, that they are bishops, and therefore, for their greatness, ought to be yielded to? the weight of episcopal power may oppress us, but cannot convince us.”[[79]](#footnote-79)

It appears from hence, that the Puritans were the king’s faithful subjects; that they complied to the utmost limit of their consciences; and that when they could not obey, they were content to suffer. Here are no principles inconsistent with the public safety; no marks of heresy, impiety, or sedition; no charges of ignorance or neglect of duty; how unreasonable, then, must it be to silence and deprive such men? to shut them up in prison, or send them with their families a begging, while their pulpit-doors were to be shut up, and there was a famine in many parts of the country, not of bread, but of the Word of the Lord;[[80]](#footnote-80) yet these honest men were not only persecuted at home, but restrained from retiring into his majesty’s dominions abroad; for when the ecclesiastical courts had driven them from their habitations and livelihoods, and were still hunting them by their informers from one end of the land to the other, several families crossed the ocean to Virginia, and invited their friends to follow; but Bancroft, being informed that great numbers were preparing to embark, obtained a proclamation prohibiting them to transport themselves to Virginia without a special license from the king; a severity hardly to be paralleled! nor was it ever imitated in this country except by Archbishop Laud.

The isles of Guernsey and Jersey having enjoyed the discipline of the French churches without disturbance all the reign of Queen Elizabeth, upon the accession of the present king addressed his majesty for a confirmation of it,[[81]](#footnote-81) which he was pleased to grant by a letter under the privy seal, in these words:

“Whereas we have been given to understand that our dear sister, Queen Elizabeth, did permit and allow, to the isles of Jersey and Guernsey, parcels of the duchy of Normandy, the use of the government of the Reformed churches of the said duchy, whereof they have stood possessed till our coming to the crown; for this cause, as well as for the edification of the Church, we do will and ordain that our said isles shall quietly enjoy their said liberty in the use of ecclesiastical discipline there now established, forbidding any one to give them any trouble or impeachment so long as they contain themselves in our obedience.

“Given at Hampton Court, August 8th, in the first year of our reign, 1603.”

But Bancroft, and some of his brethren the bishops, having possessed the king with the necessity of a general uniformity throughout all his dominions, these islands were to be included; accordingly, Sir John Peyton, a zealous churchman, was appointed governor, with secret instructions to root out the Geneva discipline, and plant the English liturgy and ceremonies.[[82]](#footnote-82) This gentleman, taking advantage of the synod’s appointing a minister to a vacant living, according to custom, protested against it as injurious to the king’s prerogative, and complained to court that the Jersey ministers had usurped the patronage of the benefices of the island; that they had admitted men to livings without the form of presentation, which was a loss to the crown in its first-fruits; that by the connivance or allowance of former governors, they exercised a kind of arbitrary jurisdiction, and therefore prayed that his majesty would settle the English discipline among them.[[83]](#footnote-83) The Jersey ministers alleged in their own defence, that the presentation to livings was a branch of their discipline, and that the payments of first-fruits and tenths had never been demanded since they were disengaged from the see of Constance. They pleaded his majesty’s royal confirmation of their discipline, which was read publicly in a synod of both islands in the year 1605. But this pious king had very little regard to promises, oaths, or charters, when they stood in the way of his arbitrary designs; he ordered, therefore, his ecclesiastical officers to pursue his instructions in the most effectual manner. Accordingly, they took the presentations to vacant livings into their own hands without consulting the presbytery; they annulled the oath, whereby all ecclesiastical and civil officers were obliged to swear to the maintenance of their discipline; and whereas all who received the holy sacrament were required to subscribe to the allowance of the general form of church government in that island, the king’s attorney-general and his friends now refused it. Their elders, likewise, were cited into the temporal courts, and stripped of their privileges; nor had they much better quarter in the consistory, for the governor and jurats made the decrees of that court ineffectual by reversing them in the Town Hall.

Complaint being made to the court of these innovations, the king sent them word that, to avoid all disputes for the future, he was determined to revive the office and authority of a dean, and to establish the English Common Prayer Book among them, which he did accordingly,[[84]](#footnote-84) and ordered the Bishop of Winchester, in whose diocese they were, to draw up some canons for the dean’s direction in the exercise of his government; which being done, and confirmed by the king, their former privileges were extinguished. Whereupon many left the islands and retired into France and Holland; however, others made a shift to support their discipline after a manner, in the island of Guernsey, where the episcopal regulations could not take place.

Mr. Robert Parker, a Puritan minister already mentioned, published this year a very learned treatise “Of the Cross in Baptism.”[[85]](#footnote-85) But the bishops, instead of answering it, persuaded the king to issue a proclamation, with an offer of a reward for apprehending him, which obliged him to abscond. A treacherous servant of the family having informed the officers where he had retired, they came and searched the house, but, by the special providence of God, he was preserved, the only room they neglected to search being that in which he was concealed, from whence he heard them quarrelling and swearing at one another, one saying they had not searched that room, and another confidently asserting the contrary, and refusing to suffer it to be searched over again. Had he been taken, he had been cast into prison, where, without doubt, says my author, he must have died. When he got into Holland he would have been chosen minister of the English church at Amsterdam, but the magistrates being afraid of disobliging King James, he went to Doesburgh, and became minister of that garrison, where he departed this life, 1630.

This year died the famous Dr. John Raynolds, king’s professor in Oxford. He was at first a zealous papist, while his brother William was a Protestant, but, by conference and disputation, the brothers converted each other, William dying an inveterate papist, and John an eminent Protestant.[[86]](#footnote-86) He was born in Devonshire, 1549, and educated in Corpus Christi College, Oxford, of which he was afterward president. He was a prodigy for reading, his memory being a living library. Dr. Hall used to say that his memory and reading were near a miracle. He had turned over all writers, profane and ecclesiastical, as councils, fathers, histories, &c. He was a critic in the languages,[[87]](#footnote-87) of a sharp wit and indefatigable industry; his piety and sanctity of life were so eminent and conspicuous, that the learned Cracanthorp used to say, that to name Raynolds was to commend virtue itself. He was also possessed of great modesty and humility. In short, says the Oxford historian, nothing can be spoken against him but that he was the pillar of Puritanism, and the grand favourer of nonconformity. At length, after a severe and mortified life, he died in his college, May 21, 1607, aged sixty-eight; and was buried with great funeral solemnity in St. Mary’s Church.[[88]](#footnote-88)

Soon after died the famous Mr. Thomas Brightman, author of a commentary upon the Song of Solomon, and the Revelations: he was born at Nottingham, and bred in Queen’s College, Cambridge, where he became a champion for nonconformity to the ceremonies. He was afterward presented by Sir John Osbourne to the rectory of Haunes in Bedfordshire, where he spent the remainder of his days in hard study, and constant application to his charge, as far as his conscience would admit.[[89]](#footnote-89) His life, says Mr. Fuller, was angelical, his learning uncommon; he was a close student, of little stature, and such a master of himself, that he was never known to be moved with anger. His daily discourse was against episcopal government, which he prophesied would shortly be overthrown,[[90]](#footnote-90) and the government of the foreign Protestant churches be erected in its place. He died suddenly upon the road, as he was riding with Sir John Osbourne in his coach, by a sudden obstruction of the liver or gall, August 24, 1607, aged fifty-one.

The king having given the reins of the Church into the hands of the prelates and their dependants, these, in return, became zealous champions for the prerogative, both in the pulpit and from the press. Two books were published this year, which maintained the most extravagant maxims of arbitrary power: one written by Cowel, LL.D., and vicar-general to the archbishop, wherein he affirms, 1. That the king is not bound by the laws, or by his coronation oath. 2. That he is not obliged to call parliaments to make laws, but may do it without them. 3. That it is a great favour to admit the consent of the subject in giving subsidies. The other, by Dr. Blackwood, a clergyman, who maintained that the English were all slaves from the Norman Conquest. The Parliament would have brought the authors to justice, but the king protected them by proroguing the houses in displeasure;[[91]](#footnote-91) and, to supply his necessities, began to raise money by monopolies of divers manufactures, to the unspeakable prejudice of the trade of the kingdom.

This year died the famous Jacobus Arminius, divinity-professor in the University of Leyden, who gave birth to the famous sect still called by his name. He was born at Oudewater, 1560. His parents dying in his infancy, he was educated at the public expense by the magistrates of Amsterdam, and was afterward chosen one of the ministers of that city in the year 1588. Being desired by one of the professors of Franequer to confute a treatise of Beza’s upon the Supralapsarian scheme of predestination, he fell himself into the contrary sentiment. In the year 1600 he was called to succeed Junius in the divinity chair of Leyden, and was the first who was solemnly created doctor of divinity in that university. Here his notions concerning predestination and grace, and the extent of Christ’s redemption, met with a powerful opposition from Gomarus and others. But though his disciples increased prodigiously in a few years, yet the troubles he met with from his adversaries, and the attacks made upon his character and reputation, broke his spirits, so that he sank into a melancholy disorder, attended with a complication of distempers, which hastened his end, after he had been professor six years, and had lived forty-nine. He is represented as a divine of considerable learning, piety, and modesty, far from going the lengths of his successors, Vorstius, Episcopius, and Curcellæus; yet his doctrines occasioned such confusion in that country as could not be terminated without a national synod, and produced great distractions in the Church of England, as will be seen hereafter.

In the Parliament which met this summer, the spirit of English liberty began to revive; one of the members made the following bold speech in the House of Commons, containing a particular representation of the grievances of the nation, and of the attempts made for the redress of them. “It begins with a complaint against the bishops in their ecclesiastical courts, for depriving, disgracing, silencing, and imprisoning such of God’s messengers (being learned and godly preachers) as he has furnished with most heavenly graces to call us to repentance, for no other cause but for not conforming themselves farther, and otherwise than by the subscription limited in the statute of the 13th Elizabeth they are bound to do, thereby making the laws of the Church and commonwealth to jar; which to reform,” says he, “we made a law for subscription, agreeing to the intent of the aforesaid statute, which would have established the peace both of Church and State; and if it had received the royal assent, would have been an occasion that many subjects might be well taught the means of their salvation, who now want sufficient knowledge of the Word of God to ground their faith upon.

“And whereas, by the laws of God and the land, ecclesiastical persons should use only the spiritual sword, by exhortation, admonition, and excommunication, which are the keys of the Church, to exclude impenitent sinners, and leave the temporal sword to the civil magistrate, which was always so used in England till the second year of the reign of King Henry IV., at which time the popish prelates got the temporal sword into their hands, which statute was since by several acts of Parliament made void, yet, by virtue of that temporal authority once for a short space by them used, some ecclesiastical persons do use both swords, and with those two swords the oath *ex officio,* which began first in England by the statute of the second of King Henry IV., being contrary to the laws of England, and, as I verily think, contrary to the laws of God.

“Wherefore, to reform these abuses, we made two good laws, one to abridge the force of the ecclesiastical commission in many points, the other to abrogate and take away the power of ecclesiastical persons to administer the oath *ex officio,* being a very hateful thing, and unlawful.

“And forasmuch as among the canons lately made by the clergy of England in convocation, it was thought that some of their canons did extend to charge the bodies, lands, and goods of the subjects of this realm farther than was lawful and meet, we therefore made a good law to make void such canons, unless the same canons were confirmed by Parliament.

“And as we had the care of the Church, so likewise of the commonwealth; and, therefore, after searching the records of the Tower, and after hearing the opinions of lawyers, we found it clear that impositions laid upon merchandise or other goods of the subject, by the king, without consent of Parliament, were not lawful; and, therefore, we passed a bill declaring that no imposition laid upon goods is lawful without consent of Parliament.

“But God has not permitted these and sundry other good laws to take effect or pass into statutes, though we earnestly desired them; if they had, both the king and his subjects would have been more happy than ever; what would we not then have given to supply the king’s wants? But as things now stand, and without reformation of the aforementioned grievances, we cannot give much, because we have no certainty of that which shall remain to us after our gift.”

To put a stop to such dangerous speeches, the king summoned both houses to Whitehall, and told them “that he did not intend to govern by the absolute power of a king, though he knew the power of kings was like the Divine power; for,” says his majesty, “as God can create and destroy, make and unmake, at his pleasure, so kings can give life and death, judge all, and be judged by none; they can exalt and abase, and, like men at chess, make a pawn take a bishop or a knight.” After this he tells the houses, that as it was blasphemy to dispute what God might do, so it was sedition in subjects to dispute what a king might do in the height of his power. He commanded them, therefore, not to meddle with the main points of government, which would be to lessen his craft, who had been thirty years at his trade in Scotland, and served an apprenticeship of seven years in England.

The Parliament, not terrified with this high language, went on steadily in asserting their rights; May 24th, 1610, twenty of the Lower House presented a remonstrance, in which they declare, “that whereas they had first received a message, and since, by his majesty’s speech, had been commanded to refrain from debating upon things relating to the chief points of government, they do hold it their undoubted right to examine into the grievances of the subject, and to inquire into their own rights and properties, as well as his majesty’s prerogative;[[92]](#footnote-92) and they most humbly and instantly beseech his gracious majesty that, without offence to the same, they may, according to the undoubted right and liberty of Parliament, proceed in their intended course against the late new impositions.”

In another petition, they beseech his majesty to put the laws in execution against papists; and with regard to the Puritans, they say, “Whereas divers learned and painful pastors that have long travailed in the work of the ministry with good fruit and blessing of their labour, who were ever ready to perform the legal subscription appointed by the 13th of Elizabeth, which only concerneth the profession of the true Christian faith and doctrine of the sacraments, yet for not conforming in some points of ceremonies, and for refusing the subscription directed by the late canons, have been removed from their ecclesiastical livings, being their freehold, and debarred from all means of maintenance, to the great grief of your majesty’s subjects, seeing the whole people that want instruction lie open to the seducement of popish and ill-affected persons; we, therefore, most humbly beseech your majesty that such deprived and silenced ministers may, by license or permission of the reverend fathers in their several dioceses, instruct and preach unto their people in such parishes and places where they may be employed, so as they apply themselves in their ministry to wholesome doctrine and exhortation, and live quietly and peaceably in their callings, and shall not, by writing or preaching, impugn things established by public authority. They also pray that dispensations for pluralities of benefices with cure of souls may be prohibited, and that toleration of nonresidency may be restrained. And forasmuch as excommunication is exercised upon an incredible number of the common people, by the subordinate officers of the jurisdiction ecclesiastical, for small causes, by the sole information of a base apparitor, so that the poor are driven to excessive expenses for matters of small moment, while the rich escape that censure by commutation of penance; they therefore most humbly pray for a reformation in the premises.”

In another petition, they represent to his majesty the great grievance of the commission ecclesiastical, and in all humility beseech his majesty to ratify the law they had prepared for reducing it within reasonable and convenient limits; they say, “that the statute 1 Eliz , cap. i., by which the commission is authorized, has been found dangerous and inconvenient on many accounts:

“First. Because it enables the making such commission to one subject born, as well as more.

“Secondly. Because, under colour of some words in the statute, whereby the commissioners are authorized to act according to the tenor and effect of your highness’s letters patent, and by letters patent grounded thereon, they do fine and imprison, and exercise other authorities not belonging to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, restored to the crown by this statute; for by the same rule your highness may by your letters patent authorize them to fine without stint, and imprison without limitation of time; as, also, according to will and discretion, without regard to any laws spiritual and temporal; they may impose utter confiscation of goods, forfeiture of lands, yea, and the taking away of limb and life itself, and this for any matter appertaining to spiritual jurisdiction, which could never be the intent of the law.

“Thirdly. Because the king, by the same statute, may set up an ecclesiastical commission in every diocese, county, and parish of England, and thereby all jurisdiction may be taken from bishops and transferred to laymen.

“Fourthly. Because every petty offence appertaining to spiritual jurisdiction is, by colour of the said words and letters patent, made subject to excommunication, whereby the smallest offenders may be obliged to travel from the most remote parts of the kingdom to London, to their utter ruin.

“Fifthly. Because it is very hard, if not impossible, to know what matters or offences are included within their commission, as appertaining to spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, it being unknown what ancient canons or laws spiritual are in force.

“As for the commission ecclesiastical itself, grounded on the statute above mentioned, it is a very great grievance, because,

“1. The same men have both spiritual and temporal jurisdiction, and may force the party by oath to accuse himself, and also inquire thereof by a jury; and, lastly, may inflict for the same offence, and at the same time, by one and the same sentence, both a spiritual and temporal punishment.

“2. Whereas, upon sentences of deprivation or other spiritual censures, given by force of ordinary jurisdiction, an appeal lies for the party grieved: this is here excluded by express words of the commission. Also, here is to be a trial by a jury, but no remedy by traverse or attaint. Nor can a man have any writ of error, though judgment be given against him, amounting to the taking away all his goods, and imprisoning him for life, yea, to the adjudging him in the case of præmunire, whereby his lands are forfeited, and he put out of the protection of the law.

“3. Whereas penal laws, and offences against them, cannot be determined in other courts, or by other persons, than those entrusted by Parliament, yet the execution of many such statutes made since the 1st Elizabeth are committed to the ecclesiastical commissioners, who may inflict the punishments contained in the statutes, being præmunire, and of other high nature, and so enforce a man upon his oath to accuse himself, or else inflict other temporal punishments at pleasure; and after this, the party shall be subject in the courts mentioned in the acts to punishments by the same acts appointed and inflicted.

“5. The commission gives authority to oblige men, not only to give recognisance for their appearance from time to time, but also for performance of whatsoever shall be by the commissioners ordered, and to pay such fees as the commissioners shall think fit.

“The execution of the commission is no less grievous to the subject; for, (1.) Laymen are punished for speaking of the simony and other misdemeanours of spiritual men, though the thing spoken be true, and tends to the inducing some condign punishment. (2.) These commissioners usually allot to women discontented and unwilling to live with their husbands such portions and maintenance as they think fit, to the great encouragement of wives to be disobedient to their husbands. And (3.) Pursuivants and other ministers employed in apprehending suspected offenders, or in searching for supposed scandalous books, break open men’s houses, closets, and desks, rifling all corners and private places, as in cases of high treason.

“A farther grievance is the stay of writs of prohibition, *habeas corpus,* and *de homine replegiando,* which are a considerable relief to the oppressed subjects of the kingdom. His majesty, in order to support the inferior courts against the principal courts of common law, had ordered things so, that writs had been more sparingly granted, and with greater caution. They therefore pray his majesty to require his judges in Westminster Hall to grant such writs in cases wherein they lie.

“But one of the greatest and most threatening grievances was the king’s granting letters patent for monopolies, as licenses for wine, alehouses, selling sea-coal, &c., which they pray his majesty to forbear for the future, that the disease may be cured, and others of like nature prevented.”

The king, instead of concurring with his Parliament, was so disgusted with their remonstrance, that he dissolved them [December 3, 1610] without passing any one act this session,[[93]](#footnote-93) after they had continued about six years; and was so out of humour with the spirit of English liberty that was growing in the houses, that he resolved, if possible, to govern without parliaments for the future. This was done by the advice of Bancroft, and other servile court flatterers, and was the beginning of that mischief, says Wilson,[[94]](#footnote-94) which, when it came to a full ripeness, made such a bloody tincture in both kingdoms as never will be got out of the bishops’ lawn sleeves.

From the time that King James came to the English throne, and long before, if we may believe Dr. Heylin, his majesty had projected the restoring episcopacy in the Kirk of Scotland, and reducing the two kingdoms to one uniform government and discipline: for this purpose Archbishop Bancroft maintained a secret correspondence with him, and corrupted one Norton, an English bookseller at Edinburgh [in the year 1589], to betray the Scots affairs to him, as he confessed, with tears, at his examination. The many curious articles he employed him to search into are set down in Calderwood’s History, p. 246. In the month of January, 1591, his letters to Mr. Patrick Adamson were intercepted, wherein he advises him “to give the Queen of England more honourable titles, and to praise the Church of England above all others. He marvelled why he came not to England, and assured him he would be well accepted by my Lord of Canterbury’s grace, and well rewarded if he came.”[[95]](#footnote-95) This Adamson was afterward excommunicated, but, repenting of what he had done against the Kirk, desired absolution: part of his confession runs thus: “I grant I was more busy with some bishops in England, in prejudice of the discipline of our kirk, partly when I was there, and partly by intelligence since, than became a good Christian, much less a faithful pastor; neither is there anything that more ashameth me than my often deceiving and abusing the Kirk heretofore by confessions, subscriptions, and protestations.”

Upon his majesty’s arrival in England, he took all occasions to discover his aversion to the Scots Presbyterians, taxing them with sauciness, ill-manners, and an implacable enmity to kingly power; he nominated bishops to the thirteen Scots bishoprics which himself had formerly abolished; but their revenues being annexed to the crown, their dignities were little more than titular. In the Parliament held at Perth, in the year 1606, his majesty obtained an act to restore the bishops to their temporalities, and to repeal the Act of Annexation; by which they were restored to their votes in Parliament, and had the title of lords of Parliament, contrary to the sense both of clergy and laity, as appears by the following protest of the General Assembly:

“In the name of Christ, and in the name of the Kirk in general, whereof the realm hath reaped comfort this forty-six years; also in the name of our presbyteries, from which we received our commission, and in our own names, as pastors and office-bearers within the same for the discharging of our necessary duty, and for the disburdening of our consciences, we except and protest against the erection, confirmation, or ratification of the said bishoprics and bishops by this present Parliament, and humbly pray that this our protestation may be admitted and registered among the records.”

In the Convention at Linlithgow, December 12, consisting of noblemen, statesmen, and some court ministers, it was agreed that the bishops should be perpetual moderators of the Kirk assemblies, under certain cautions, and with a declaration that they had no purpose to subvert the discipline of the Kirk, or to exercise any tyrannous or unlawful jurisdiction over their brethren; but the body of the ministers being uneasy at this, another convention was held at Linlithgow, 1608, and a committee appointed to compromise the difference; the committee consisted of two earls and two lords, as his majesty’s commissioners; five new bishops, two university men, three ministers on one part, and ten for the other; they met at Falkland, May 4, 1609, and debated, (1.) Whether the moderators of kirk assemblies should be constant or circular; and (2.) Whether the caveats should be observed. But coming to no agreement, they adjourned to Striveling, where the bishops with great difficulty carried their point. And to increase their power, his majesty was pleased next year [in the month of February, 1610], contrary to law, to put the high commission into their hands.

Still they wanted the sanction of a general assembly, and a spiritual character: to obtain the former, an assembly was held at Glasgow, June 8, 1610, means having been used by the courtiers to model it to their mind. In that costly assembly, says my author,[[96]](#footnote-96) the bishops were declared moderators in every diocesan assembly, and they or their deputies moderators in their weekly exercises; ordination and deprivation of ministers, visitation of kirks, excommunication and absolution, with presentation to benefices, were pinned to the lawn sleeves; and it was farther voted, (1.) That every minister at his entry shall swear obedience to his ordinary. (2.) That no minister shall preach or speak the acts of this assembly. (3.) That the question of the parity or imparity of pastors shall not be mentioned in the pulpit under pain of deprivation. This was a vast advance upon the constitution of the Kirk.

To obtain a spiritual character superior to the order of presbyters, it was necessary that the bishops elect should be consecrated by some of the same order; for this purpose the king sent for three of them into England, viz., Mr. Spotswood, archbishop of Glasgow, Mr. Lamb, bishop of Brechen, and Mr. Hamilton, bishop of Galloway, and issued a commission under the great seal to the Bishops of London, Ely, Bath and Wells, and Rochester, requiring them to proceed to the consecration of the above-mentioned bishops according to the English ordinal: Andrews, bishop of Ely, was of opinion that before the consecration they ought to be made priests, because they had not been ordained by a bishop. This the Scots divines were unwilling to admit, through fear of the consequences among their own countrymen; for what must they conclude concerning the ministers of Scotland, if their ordination as presbyters was not valid? Bancroft, therefore, yielded, that where bishops could not be had, ordination by presbyters must be valid, otherwise the character of the ministers in most of the Reformed churches might be questioned. Abbot, bishop of London,[[97]](#footnote-97) and others, were of opinion that there was no necessity of passing through the inferior orders of deacon and priest, but that the episcopal character might be conveyed at once, as appears from the example of St. Ambrose, Nectarius, Eucherius, and others, who from mere laymen were advanced at once into the episcopal chair.[[98]](#footnote-98) But whether this supposition does not rather weaken the arguments for bishops being a distinct order from presbyters, I leave with the reader. However, the Scotch divines were consecrated in the chapel at London House [October 21, 1610], and upon their return into Scotland conveyed their new character in the same manner to their brethren.[[99]](#footnote-99) Thus the king, by a usurped supremacy over the Kirk of Scotland, and other violent and indirect means, subverted their ecclesiastical constitution; and contrary to the genius of the people, and the protestation of the General Assembly, the bishops were made lords of council, lords of Parliament, and lord-commissioners in causes ecclesiastical; but with all their high titles they sat uneasy in their chairs, being generally hated both by the ministers and people.

About ten days after this consecration, Dr. Richard Bancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, departed this life; he was born at Farnworth in Lancashire, 1544, and educated in Jesus College, Cambridge. He was first chaplain to Cox, bishop of Ely, who gave him the rectory of Teversham, near Cambridge. In the year 1585 he proceeded D.D., and being ambitious of preferment, got into the service of Sir Christopher Hatton, by whose recommendation he was made prebendary of Westminster. Here he signalized himself by preaching against the Puritans, a sure way to preferment in those times. He also wrote against their discipline, and was *the first in the Church of England who openly maintained the Divine right of the order of bishops.* While he sat in the High Commission, he distinguished himself by an uncommon zeal against the Nonconformists, for which he was preferred, first to the bishopric of London, and, upon Whitgift’s decease, to the see of Canterbury; how he behaved in that high station has been sufficiently related. This prelate left behind him no extraordinary character for piety, learning, hospitality, or any other episcopal quality. He was of a rough, inflexible temper, yet a tool of the prerogative, and an enemy to the laws and constitution of his country. Some have represented him as inclined to popery because he maintained several secular priests in his own house, but this was done, say his advocates, to keep up the controversy between them and the Jesuits. Lord Clarendon says[[100]](#footnote-100) “that he understood the Church excellently well; that he had almost rescued it out of the hands of the Calvinian party, and very much subdued the unruly spirit of the Nonconformists; and that he countenanced “men of learning.” His lordship might have added that he was covetous,[[101]](#footnote-101) passionate, ill-natured, and a cruel persecutor of good men; that he laid aside the hospitality becoming a bishop, and lived without state or equipage, which gave occasion to the following satire upon his death, which happened November 2, 1610, aged sixty-six:

Here lies his grace in cold clay clad,

Who died for want of what he had.
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“This conference,” says another writer, “was but a blind to introduce episcopacy in Scotland; all the Scotch noblemen then at court being designed to be present, and others, both noblemen and ministers, being called up from Scotland by the king’s letter to assist at it.”—*Dr. Welwood,* as quoted by *Crosby. Hist, of Engl. Baptists,* vol. 1., p. 85.— Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. “The Hampton Court Conference,” says Robert Robinson, of Cambridge, “was a ridiculous farce, a compound of kingcraft and priestcraft. The actors in it forgot nothing but their masks. The Puritans would not be gulled by it, but continued to dissent, and they were right.”—*Lectures on the Principles of Nonconformity, Works,* ii., 221.

“In the accounts that we read of this meeting,” remarks Mr. Hallam, “we are alternately struck with wonder at the indecent and partial behaviour of the king, and at the abject baseness of the bishops, mixed, according to the customs of servile natures, with insolence towards their opponents. It was easy for a monarch and eighteen churchmen to claim the victory, be the merits of the dispute what they might, over abashed and intimidated adversaries.”— *Const. Hist.,* i., 404.—C. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. The conclusion of his address to the Puritan ministers, at this conference, as it was a curious specimen of the king’s logic, so it was a proof of the insolent and tyrannical spirit with which he aimed to bear down all opposition. “If,” said he, “this be all your party hath to say, I will make them conform themselves, or else 1 will harrie them out of the land, or else do worse, only hang them, that’s all.” It is very evident, from this, that he trusted more, as it has been observed by a modern writer, to the power of hanging than of convincing his adversaries.—*Secret History of the Court and Reign of Charles II.,* vol. i,, Introduction, p. 23, the note.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Dugdale calls him the standard-bearer of the Puritans, and says he was the first in the Church of England who began to pray extempore before sermons. Fuller says “he was most pious and strict in his conversation, a pure Latinist, an accurate Grecian, an exact Hebrean, and, in short, an excellent scholar.” And yet Churton, in his Life of Nowell, p. 225, casts a slur upon his piety, learning, and good sense. He charges Cartwright with saying, in a correspondence, “that prayer was, as it were, a bunch of keys, whereby we go to all the treasures and storehouses of the Lord; his butteries, his pantries, his cellars, his wardrobe.” All this, perhaps, did enter into a familiar letter. Well, what if it did? it was just in the taste of the times; but Churton makes everything bad out of these few words. He exclaims, “Does fanaticism extinguish all taste and judgment? or is it only in minds originally weak that the infection can fit itself? Which ever way the reader may solve the problem, he will naturally ask, Was this the man that was to improve what had been done by Cranmer and Ridley, by Parker and Nowell, and their coadjutors? to give us a form of worship more pure and edifying, more dignified and devout?” But, says Brookes, “this eloquent calumniator does not stop here: he felt the poetic flame arise, and therefore immediately asks,

“‘Is this the region, this the soil, the clime,

That we must change for heaven? this mournful gloom

For that celestial light?’

We do confess that so much bombast, scurrility, and barefaced misrepresentation were scarcely ever found within so small a compass. The reader will, at the same time, easily perceive that the whole is designed to extol the Church of England, if not above perfection, at least beyond the possibility of amendment, and to blacken the character and disgrace the memory of that man, who was justly esteemed one of the most celebrated divines of the age in which he lived.”—*Brookes, Lives of Puritans,* vol. i., p. 161.—C. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Clarke’s Lives annexed to his General Martyrology, p. 16. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. For his sake the salary of Lady Margaret’s professorship was raised from twenty marks to £20. And it is observed to his honour, that this prelate was the great restorer of order and discipline in the University of Cambridge, when deeply wounded and almost sunk.—*Granger’s History of England,* 8vo, vol. i., p. 206.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. “Even sometimes it may be,” says Dr. Warner, “beyond all other law but that of her majesty’s pleasure.”—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Life of Whitgift, p. 108. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. Fuller’s Church History, book x., p. 25. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Stype’s words, Dr. Grey says, are, “Et nunc Domine exaltata est mea anima, quod in eo tempore succubui, quando mallem episcopatus mei reddere rationem, quam inter homines exercere.”—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. The character of Whitgift’s administration appears plain in the page of history. It embodied the worst passions of an intolerant state priest, and stood out in the history of Protestant persecution as worthy of special reprobation. It knew no mercy—it exercised no compassion. It had but one object, and that it pursued without compunction or remorse. The most conscientious of the queen’s subjects were mingled with the vilest of their race. Whatever was noble in character, elevated in sentiment, or pure and ethereal in devotion, was confounded with the baser elements of society, and proscribed and punished as an offence to God and treason against the state. The legal institutions of the kingdom were converted into means of oppression, and the dark recesses of its prisons resounded at once with the sighs and prayers of men of whom the world was not worthy, it is in vain to defend the administration of Whitgift on the ground of the excesses of the Puritans. Those excesses were provoked by his cruelty. They grew out of government, the unmitigated rigour of which exasperated the spirits and soured the temper of his opponents. Neither can the archbishop be justified on the plea that he acted on the commands of the queen. His servility was, indeed, contemptible, but his ecclesiastical measures had their origin in his own breast. He was the queen’s adviser, to whose judgment she deferred, and of whose hearty concurrence in every measure of severity and intolerance she was fully assured. Several of her counsellors were opposed to his severity, “but secure of the queen’s support, Whitgift relented not a jot of his resolution, and went far greater lengths than Parker had ever ventured, or perhaps had desired to proceed.” His administration involved an immense sacrifice of life. It is easy to number the martyrs whom popery led to the stake, but no other than an omniscient being is competent to reveal the secrets of his dark and loathsome prison-houses. Many of his victims entered with a robust frame and a vigorous spirit, but the one was wasted by disease and the other broken down by oppression, till the last enemy released them from the tyrant’s grasp, and ushered them into the presence of the King of kings. The Protestant Church of England is deeply steeped in the blood of the saints. The martyrdom it inflicted was less violent, and less calculated to shock the public mind, but it was not a jot less cruel or wicked than that which Bonner and Gardiner practised. — See *Dr. Price’s History of Nonconformity,* vol. i., p. 471. Consult *Hallam’s Constitutional History,* vol. i., p. 271.—C. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Rapin, vol. ii p. 163, folio edition. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. “The Puritans about this time,” says Mrs. Macaulay, “suffered so severe a persecution, that they were driven to offer a petition for relief to the king while he was taking the diversion of hunting. James was something startled at this unexpected intrusion, and very graciously directed them to depute ten of their members to declare their grievances to the council. These deputies no sooner made their appearance before the council than they were sent to jail, and Sir Francis Hastings, Sir Edward Montague, and Sir Valentine Knightly, under whose protection they had thus acted, were turned out of the lieutenancy of the county and the commission of the peace.”—*Winwood’s Memorials,* quoted by *Mrs. Macaulay, Hist, of England,* vol. i., p. 7, note, 8vo.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Rapin, vol. ii., p. 165, 166, folio ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Rapin, vol. ii., p. 167, 168, folio ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Ibid., vol. ii., p. 252. Coke, p. 51. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. “This,” as Dr. Warner well observes, “was directly striking at the privileges of the Commons.” —Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. We are told, in particular, that Cecil assured James, on his coming to the crown, “that he should find his English subjects like asses, on whom he might lay any burden, and should need neither bit nor bridle but their asses’ ears.” “His reign, however, affords sufficient proof.” observes a late writer, “that the king himself was the only ass, and that the English lions were not to be intimidated by his silly braying.”—*Secret History of the Court and Reign of Charles II.,* vol. i., Introduction, p. 30, note.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Heylin’s Hist. Presb., p. 375. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Strype’s Annals, vol. iv., p. 396. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. Dr. Grey also gives this speech of Bishop Rudd at length, inserting in brackets some words and clauses both from Mr Pierce and Mr. Thomas Baker’s MSS., omitted by Mr. Neal, in order to convict himself of inaccuracy; but from the nature of them, it should seem that these omissions proceeded not from negligence, but design, as not essential to Bishop Rudd’s argument.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. The causes which led to Bancroft’s elevation are thus stated by Sir John Harrington: “His majesty had long since understanding of his writing against the *Genevesing* and *Scottising* ministers; and though some imagined he had therein given the king some distaste, yet finding him in the disputations at Hampton Court both learned and stout, he did more and more increase his liking to him; so that although in the common rumour Thoby Matthew was likeliest to have carried it, so learned a man and so assiduous a preacher, *qui in concionilnis dominatur,* as his emulous and bitter enemy wrote of him, yet his majesty, in his learning knowing, and in his wisdom weighing, that this same strict charge, *‘pasce oves meos,’* feed my sheep, requires as well a pastoral courage of driving in the stray sheep and driving out the infectious, as of feeding the sound, made special choice of the Bishop of London, as a man more exercised in the affairs of the state. I will add also mine own conjecture out of some of his majesty’s own speeches, that in respect, he was a single man, he supposed him the fitter, according to Queen Elizabeth’s principles of state, upon whose wise foundations his majesty doth daily erect more glorious buildings.”—*Nugæ Antiques,* vol. ii., p. 25—C. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. Address of the French and Dutch churches to the Bishop of London, Strype’s Annals, vol. iv., p. 390. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. Utenhovius and Edmund Grindal, as Dr. Grey observes, are not mentioned in the bishop’s answer, though they are in Fontaine’s speech.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. Strype’s Annals, vol. v., p. 395. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. This account is controverted by Dr. Grey on the authority of Heylin’s Acr. Rediviv.. p. 376, who says “that, by the rolls brought in by Bishop Bancroft before his death, it appears that there had been but forty-five deprived on all occasions, which, in a realm containing nine thousand parishes, could be no great matter. But it was that, by the punishment of some of the principals, he struck such a general terror into all the rest, that inconfurniity grew out of fashion in less time than could be easily imagined.”—Ed. Calderwood says there were “three hundred,’’ and he is supported by the author of “*A* *Short Dialogue,*” 1605, who says “their names amounted, 1st November, 1605, to 270 and *upward,* yet there were eight bishoprics whereof it could not yet be learned what had been done in them.”—P. 58.—C. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. Eccles. Hist., p. 687. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. Crook’s Reports, Mich, term, 2 Jac., part ii., p. 37, parag. 13. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. The reader is referred to Vaughan’s Stuart Dynasty, vol. i., p. 139.—C. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. “This (as Dr. Warner well observes) was making the king absolute in all ecclesiastical affairs, without any limitation or redress; and it was intended, probably, as a step to make him so in the state.” Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. The number of nonsubscribers in

Oxfordshire, were . . 9

Statfordshire ... 14

Dorsetshire .... 17

Hertfordshire ... 17

Nottinghamshire ... 20

Surrey ... 21

Norfolk ... 28

Wiltshire ... 31

Buckinghamshire ... 33

Sussex ... 47

Leicestershire ... 57

Cheshire ... 12

Bedfordshire ... 16

Somersetshire ... 17

Derbyshire .... 20

Lancashire ... 21

Kent ... 23

London ... 30

Lincolnshire ... 33

Warwickshire ... 44

Devon and Cornwall ... 51

Northamptonshire ... 57

Suffolk ... 71

Essex ... 57

In the twenty-four counties above mentioned — 746. From whence it is reasonable to conclude, that in the fifty-two counties of England and Wales, there were more than double the number. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. Pierce’s Vindication, p. 174. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. These conscientious exiles, driven from their own country by persecution, instead of meeting with a hospitable reception or even a quiet refuge in Holland, were there “loaded with reproaches, despised, and afflicted by all, and almost consumed with deep poverty.” The learned Ainsworth, we are told, lived upon ninepence a week and some boiled roots, and was reduced to the necessity of hiring himself as a porter to a bookseller, who first of all discovered his skill in the Hebrew language, and made it known to his countrymen. The Dutch themselves, just emerged from civil and religious oppression, looked with a jealous eye on these suffering refugees. And though the civil power, commonly in every state more friendly than the ecclesiastic to toleration, does not appear to have oppressed them; the clergy would not afford them an opportunity to refute the unfavourable reports generally circulated against them on the authority of letters from England, nor receive their confession of faith, nor give them an audience on some points on which they desired to lay their sentiments before them; but with a man at their head of no less eminence than James Arminius, judged that they ought to petition the magistrate for leave to hold their assemblies for the worship of God, and informed against them in such a way as might have rendered them the objects of suspicion. “They seemed evidently,” it has been remarked, “to have considered them in the same light in which serious and conscientious dissenters from the religious profession of the majority will ever be viewed, as a set of discontented, factious, and conceited men, with whom it would be safest for them to have no connexion.”—Ainsworth’s two Trealises on *The Communion of Saints,* and *An Arrow against Idolatry,* printed at Edinburgh, 1789, pref, p. 15-17.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. A late writer, who appears to have accurately investigated the history of the Brownists, represents Mr. Neal as incorrect in his account of the debates which arose among them. The principal leaders of this party were the two brothers Francis and George Johnson, Mr. Ainsworth, and Mr. John Smith, who had been a clergyman in England. Three principal subjects of controversy occasioned dissensions in the Brownist churches. The first ground of dissension was the marriage of Francis Johnson with a widow of a taste for living and dress, particularly unsuitable to times of persecution: his father and his brother opposed this connexion. This occasioned such a difference that the latter proceeded from admonitions and reproofs to bitter revilings and reproaches, and Francis Johnson, his colleague Ainsworth, and the church at length passed a sentence of excommunication against the father and brother. Mr. Neal, it seems, confounds this unhappy controversy with another that succeeded to it, but distinct from it, between Francis Johnson and Ainsworth. It turned upon a question of discipline; the former placing the government of the Church in the eldership alone, the latter in the Church, of which the elders are a part. This dispute was carried to an unchristian height, but, according to Mr. John Cotton, of New-England, who was the contemporary of Johnson and Ainsworth, and had lived amid the partisans of each side, they did not, as Mr. Neal represents the matter, mutually excommunicate each other, but Ainsworth and his company withdrew, and worshipped by themselves after Johnson and those with him had denied the communion. In the interim of these debates, a schism had taken place in the church, headed by Mr. John Smith, who advanced and maintained opinions similar to those afterward espoused by Arminius; and besides his sentiments concerning baptism, to which Mr. Neal refers in the next paragraph, several singular opinions were ascribed to him; as, that no translation of the Bible could be properly the Word of God, but the original only was so; that singing set words or verses to God was without any proper authority; that flight in time of persecution was unlawful; that the new creature needed not the support of Scriptures and ordinances, but is above them; that perfection is attainable in this life, &e. There arose against him a whole host of opponents; Johnson, Robinson, Clifton, Ainsworth, and Jessop. His character as well as his sentiments were attacked with a virulence of spirit and an abusive language that discredit the charges and expose the spirit of the writer’s.—See some account of Mr. Ainsworth, prefixed to a new edition of his two treatises, p. 27-12; and *Crosby’s History of English Baptists,* vol. i., p. 3., Ac., and p. 265, &c.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Others say that he obtained this conference, and so confounded the Jews that from pique and malice they in this manner put an end to his life. He died in 1622 or 1623, leaving an exemplary character for humility, sobriety, discretion, and unblamable virtue.—See an account prefixed to his two treatises, p. 60, 62.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. This is said on the authority of his opponents only, who, from the acrimony with which they wrote against him, it may be reasonably concluded, might be ready to take up a report against him upon slender evidence. His defences of himself and his opinions have not been, for many years, to be met with; but the large quotations from them in the writings of his opponents afforded not the least intimation, either in the way of concession or justification, of his having done such a thing; the contrary may be rather concluded from them. The first ground of his separation from the Established Church was a dislike of its ceremonies and prescribed forms of prayer; he afterward doubted concerning the validity of baptism administered in a national church; this paved the way for his rejecting the baptism of infants altogether, and adopting immersion as the true and only meaning of the word baptism. His judgment on doctrinal points underwent similar changes. Hence, Mr. Neal has called him a man “of an unsettled head.” This language seems to insinuate a reflection on Mr. Smith: whereas it is an honour to any man; it shows candour, ingenuousness, an openness to conviction, and sincerity, for one to change his sentiments *on farther inquiry,* and to avow it. A lover of truth, especially who has imbibed in early life the principles of the corrupt establishments of Christianity, will continually find it his duty to recede from his first sentiments. Bishop Tillotson justly commended his friend Dr. Whichcot; because while it is customary with learned men at a certain age to *make their understandings,* the doctor was so wise as to be willing to learn to the last; *i.e.,* he was of an unsettled head.—*Crosby’s History of the English Baptists,* vol. i., p. 65, &c. *Account of Mr. Ainsworth* prefixed to his two treatises, p. 41.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. Boyle’s Dissuasive, p. 177. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. “Profiteinur coram Deo et hoininibus adeo nobis convenire cum eccleshs reformatis Belgicis in re religionis ut omnibus et singulis earnndein ecclesiarum fidei articulis, prout habentur in Harmonia Confes-sionum Fidei, parati sumus subscribcre. Ecclesias reformatas pro veris et genuinis habenius, cum iisdem in sacris Dei communionem profiteinur, et quantum in nobis est, colimus. Conciones publicas ab illarum pastoribus habitas, ex nostris qui norunt lin-guam Belgicam frequentant: sacram ceCnam earum inembris, si qua forte nostris ccetibus intersint nobis cognita, participiamus.” [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. Life of Whitgift, p. 566. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. Ath. Ox., vol. i., p. 394. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. Rapin, vol. ii., p. 171. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. Osborne, p. 448. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. History of Presbytery, p. 378. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. King James’s Apol, p. 253. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. Abridgment, p. 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. Abridgment, p. 28. [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
70. Ibid., p. 31. [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. Ibid., p. 37. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
72. Ibid., p. 45. [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
73. Abridgment, p. 52. [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
74. Abridgment, p. 59. [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
75. Acts and Mon., p. 19. [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
76. Hist. Eccl., lib. vii., cap. viii. [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
77. Several things, considered as remarkable by Dr. Grey, are omitted by Mr. Neal. But this doth not impeach Mr. Neal’s fairness, as he avowedly lays only an abstract before his readers; and the passages to which Dr. Grey alludes do not convey sentiments repugnant to the principles exhibited in the above abstract.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
78. Dr. Grey says that the word *civil* is added by Mr. Neal, and that he has omitted, after “dominions,” the clause “in all cases whatsoever.”—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
79. Episcoporum auctoritas opprimere nos potest, docere non potest.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
80. Rapin, vol. ii., p. 176, 195, folio edition. [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
81. Dr. Grey quotes here Collyer’s Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii., p. 705, in contradiction to Mr. Neal, and to charge the Puritans as “addressing King James with a false suggestion, that the discipline had been allowed by Queen Elizabeth.” Dr. Grey’s stricture would have been superseded, if he had attended to Mr. Neal’s state of the business; who says only, that “the discipline of the French churches had been enjoyed without disturbance all the reign of Queen Elizabeth,” without asserting whether this indulgence were owing to connivance or to an express grant. Heylin, however, says that the “Genevian discipline had been settled by Queen Elizabeth.”—*Hist. of Presb.,* p. 395. And Collyer himself owns, that though the queen allowed only one church to adopt the model of Geneva, and enjoined the use of the English liturgy in all others, yet it was soon laid aside by all the churches, and the Geneva plan adopted by the decree of synods, held under the countenance of the governors of Guernsey and the neighbouring isles. These authorities fully justify Mr. Neal’s representation.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
82. Heyl., Hist. Presb., p. 396, and Collyer’s Eccles. Hist., p. 705. [↑](#footnote-ref-82)
83. Heylin’s Hist. Presb., p. 396. [↑](#footnote-ref-83)
84. Collyer, vol. ii., p. 706. Heylin’s Hist. Presb., p. 398, 399. [↑](#footnote-ref-84)
85. Pierce, p. 171. [↑](#footnote-ref-85)
86. Fuller’s Abel Redivivus, p. 477. [↑](#footnote-ref-86)
87. Wood’s Ath., vol. i., p. 290. [↑](#footnote-ref-87)
88. In 1604 James appointed Dr. Raynolds, on account of his uncommon skill in Greek and Hebrew, to be one of the translators of the Bible, but he did not live to see its completion. During his long illness his learned associates in Oxford met at his lodgings once a week, to compare their notes. He was thus employed translating the Word of Life till he himself was translated to life everlasting.—*Fuller’s Abel Redivivus,* p. 487, 488.—C. [↑](#footnote-ref-88)
89. Church Hist., b. x., p. 50. [↑](#footnote-ref-89)
90. “How,” asks Bishop Warburton, “would the historian have us understand this? As true prophecy to be fulfilled, or a false prophet confuted?” The reply is, Mr. Neal is to be understood as his author Mr. Fuller, from whom he quotes. Neither meant to ascribe to Mr. Brightman a prophetic inspiration, but only to relate his sentiments and apprehensions; to which, however the bishop may sneer, the events of the next reign bore a correspondence. The clause, “and the government of the foreign Protestant churches,” &c., as Dr. Grey observes, is not in Fuller; who, however, says that Mr. Brightman gave offence by “resembling the Church of England to lukewarm Laodicea, praising and preferring the purity of foreign Protestant churches.” He always carried about him a Greek Testament, which he read through every fortnight. Cartwright used to call him “the bright star in the Church of God.” —C. [↑](#footnote-ref-90)
91. Rapin says, as Dr. Grey observes, “the king interposed, and frustrated the Parliament’s design, by publishing a proclamation, to forbid the reading of these books, and to order copies to be delivered to the magistrates. But such proclamations are usually ill obeyed, especially when it is not the king’s interest to see them strictly executed.” So that by these measures the king screened the persons of the authors.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-91)
92. Warner’s Eccles. History, vol. ii., p. 495, 496. [↑](#footnote-ref-92)
93. Fuller’s Church Hist., b. x., p. 56. [↑](#footnote-ref-93)
94. Hist. of King James, p. 46. [↑](#footnote-ref-94)
95. Pierce, p. 166. [↑](#footnote-ref-95)
96. Course of Scots Conformity, p. 53. [↑](#footnote-ref-96)
97. Collyer, as Dr. Grey observes, mentions that as Bancroft’s opinion, which Mr. Neal ascribes to Bishop Abbot.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-97)
98. Collyer’s Eccles. Hist., vol. i., p. 702. [↑](#footnote-ref-98)
99. Calderwood, p. 644. [↑](#footnote-ref-99)
100. Vol. i., p. 88, ed. 1707. [↑](#footnote-ref-100)
101. Fuller, and after him Dr. Grey and Dr. Warner, vindicate the character of Archbishop Bancroft from the charges of cruelty and covetousness, “which, when they are examined into,” says Dr. Warner, “appear not to deserve those opprobrious names in the strictest acceptation.” On the other hand, the author of the Confessional calls him the fiery Bancroft, and Dr. Warner sums up his account of him in a manner not very honourable to his name. “In short,” says he, “there have been archbishops who have been much worse than Bancroft, who by their good-humour and generosity have been more esteemed when living, and more lamented at their death.”—*Eccles. Hist.,* vol. ii., p. 497.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-101)